arXiv:0806.3196v2 [hep-th] 2 Sep 2008

CERN-PH-TH/132

$d = 4$ Attractors, Effective Horizon Radius and Fake Supergravity

Sergio Ferrara[$\diamondsuit$ $\clubsuit$], **Alessandra Gnecchi**[$\spadesuit$ $\diamondsuit$] **and Alessio Marrani**[$\heartsuit$ $\clubsuit$]

$\diamondsuit$ *Physics Department,Theory Unit, CERN,*
CH 1211, Geneva 23, Switzerland
`sergio.ferrara@cern.ch`

$\clubsuit$ *INFN - Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati,*
Via Enrico Fermi 40,I-00044 Frascati, Italy
`marrani@lnf.infn.it`

$\spadesuit$ *Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pisa*
and INFN - Sezione di Pisa,
Largo B. Pontecorvo 3, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
`gnecchi@df.unipi.it`

$\heartsuit$ *Museo Storico della Fisica e*
Centro Studi e Ricerche "Enrico Fermi"
Via Panisperna 89A, I-00184 Roma, Italy

Abstract

We consider extremal black hole attractors (both BPS and non-BPS) for $\mathcal{N} = 3$ and $\mathcal{N} = 5$ supergravity in $d = 4$ space-time dimensions.

Attractors for *matter-coupled* $\mathcal{N} = 3$ theory are similar to attractors in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to Abelian vector multiplets.

On the other hand, $\mathcal{N} = 5$ attractors are similar to attractors in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ *pure* supergravity, and in such theories only $\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}}$-BPS non-degenerate solutions exist.

All the above mentioned theories have a simple interpretation in the *first order (fake supergravity)* formalism. Furthermore, such theories do not have a $d = 5$ uplift.

Finally we comment on the *"duality"* relations among the attractor solutions of $\mathcal{N} \geq 2$ supergravities sharing the same full bosonic sector.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Fake Supergravity Formalism and Effective Horizon Radius for $d = 4$ Extremal Black Holes **5**

3 $\mathcal{N} = 2$ *Minimally Coupled* Supergravity **8**
- 3.1 Attractor Equations and their Solutions 9
  - 3.1.1 $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS Attractors 9
  - 3.1.2 Non-BPS ($Z = 0$) Attractors and their Moduli Space 11
- 3.2 Black Hole Parameters for $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS Flow 12
- 3.3 Black Hole Parameters for Non-BPS ($Z = 0$) Flow 14

4 $\mathcal{N} = 3$ Supergravity **15**
- 4.1 Attractor Equations and their Solutions 18
  - 4.1.1 $\frac{1}{3}$-BPS Attractors and their Moduli Space 18
  - 4.1.2 Non-BPS ($Z_{AB} = 0$) Attractors and their Moduli Space 19
- 4.2 Black Hole Parameters for $\frac{1}{3}$-BPS Flow 20
- 4.3 Black Hole Parameters for Non-BPS ($Z_{AB} = 0$) Flow 21

5 Black Hole Entropy in *Minimally Coupled* $\mathcal{N} = 2$ and $\mathcal{N} = 3$ Supergravity **23**

6 $\mathcal{N} = 5$ Supergravity **23**
- 6.1 Attractor Equations and their Solutions 27
  - 6.1.1 Entropy of $\frac{1}{5}$-BPS Attractors and their Moduli Space 28
- 6.2 Black Hole Parameters for $\frac{1}{5}$-BPS Flow 29

7 $\mathcal{N} = 4$ *Pure* Supergravity Revisited **31**
- 7.1 Attractor Equations and their Solutions : $\frac{1}{4}$-BPS Attractors and their Entropy 32
- 7.2 Black Hole Parameters for $\frac{1}{4}$-BPS Flow 33

8 Peculiarity of *Pure* $\mathcal{N} = 4$ and $\mathcal{N} = 5$ Supergravity **35**

9 $\mathcal{N} \geqslant 2$ Supergravities with the same Bosonic Sector and *"Dualities"* **36**

10 Conclusion **38**

A Appendix I A Counterexample : $\mathcal{N} = 4$ *Matter-Coupled* Supergravity **40**

1 Introduction

The *Attractor Mechanism* [1]–[4] is an important dynamical phenomenon in the theory of gravitational objects, which naturally appears in modern theories of gravity, such as supergravity, superstrings [5]–[8] or *M-theory* [9, 10].

Even if such a phenomenon was originally shown to occur for $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS extremal black holes (BHs) in $\mathcal{N}=2$, $d=4$ ungauged supergravity coupled to Abelian vector multiplets, it has a more general validity, since it may take place also for non-BPS extremal BHs, irrespective of whether the underlying gravitational theory is endowed with local supersymmetry or not [11]–[66] (for further developments, see also *e.g.* [67]–[70]). Moreover, such a phenomenon also exists in higher space-time dimensions for black p-branes coupled to scalar fields, provided certain constraints are met.

In theories with $\mathcal{N}>2$ local supersymmetry, extremal BH attractors with regular horizon geometry and non-vanishing classical Bekenstein-Hawking entropy exhibit a new feature. This indicates that the Hessian matrix of a suitably defined *effective BH potential* V_{BH} may present, in contrast with the $\mathcal{N}=2$ case, "flat" directions even for ($\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}}$-)BPS configurations. This is for instance the case when the scalar manifold is a locally symmetric space, as it holds for all $\mathcal{N}>2$, $d=4$ supergravities. A general analysis of extremal BH attractors in $\mathcal{N}=2$ symmetric special Kähler geometry was performed in [25], and the related moduli spaces were discovered and classified in [41]. For $\mathcal{N}>2$ supergravities similar results were obtained in [71] and [56]. In [38] it was further observed that "flat" directions for $\mathcal{N}>2$ (both $\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}}$-BPS and non-BPS) attractors, as well as for $\mathcal{N}=2$ non-BPS attractors, are closely related to the fact that in $\mathcal{N}=2$ ungauged supergravity the hypermultiplets' scalars do not participate in the Attractor Mechanism. As a consequence, the moduli space of $\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}}$-BPS attractors in $\mathcal{N}>2$ supergravities is a quaternionic manifold, spanned by the left-over would-be hypermultiplets' scalar degrees of freedom in the supersymmetry reduction of the original theory down to $\mathcal{N}=2$.

The corresponding orbits of electric and magnetic BH charges, supporting the critical points of V_{BH} which determine the attractor scalar configurations on the BH event horizon, have also been classified in [25] and [56]. The non-compactness of the stabilizer of such orbits (with the only exception of $\mathcal{N}=2$ BPS orbits) is responsible for the existence of "flat" directions of the BH potential at its corresponding critical points.

Most of the supergravities based on symmetric scalar manifolds have the property that the classical BH entropy, as given by the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy-area formula [72], is expressed in terms of the square root of the absolute value of a(n *unique*) invariant $\mathcal{I}_4$ of the relevant representation of the U-duality group. Such an invariant is *quartic* in electric and magnetic BH charges:

$$S_{BH}=\frac{A}{4}=\pi\left.V_{BH}\right|_{\partial V_{BH}=0}=\pi\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_4|}. \tag{1.1}$$

$\mathcal{I}_4$, which is *moduli-independent*, can also be written in terms of the *"dressed"* charges, *i.e.* in terms of the *moduli-dependent central charge matrix* and *matter charges*, in a(n *unique*) combination, such that the overall dependence on moduli drops out. However, a peculiar class of $d=4$ supergravities exists, such that the *unique* U-duality invariant (and thus moduli-independent) combination of *"dressed"* charges turns out to be a *perfect square* of a *quadratic* expression in the skew-eigenvalues of the relevant *central charge matrix*. Namely, this holds for *pure* $\mathcal{N}=4$ [73] and $\mathcal{N}=5$ [74] supergravity.

Furthermore, another class of $d=4$ theories exists, so that the unique U-invariant $\mathcal{I}_2$ is *quadratic* in BH charges, yielding:

$$S_{BH}=\frac{A}{4}=\pi\left.V_{BH}\right|_{\partial V_{BH}=0}=\pi\left|\mathcal{I}_2\right|. \tag{1.2}$$

$\mathcal{I}_2$ is also given by a *quadratic* expression in terms of the *"dressed"* charges. Such a class of theories is given by $\mathcal{N}=2$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to Abelian vector multiplets [75], and by $\mathcal{N}=3$ supergravity coupled to matter (Abelian vector) multiplets [76].

For both the peculiar class of theories admitting $\mathcal{I}_4$ as a *perfect square* of the skew-eigenvalues of the *central charge matrix* and the supergravities admitting $\mathcal{I}_2$, there is a very simple alternative expression for the classical Bekenstein-Hawking entropy in terms of a *(square) effective horizon radius* R_H. This turns out to be *moduli-independent*, and dependent *only* on the set of magnetic and electric BH charges, shortly indicated as (p,q). The formula for the entropy of the extremal BH in these cases reads:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{BH} &= \frac{A}{4} = \pi \left. V_{BH}\right|_{\partial V_{BH}=0} \equiv \pi R_H^2(p,q) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \pi\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_4|} \\ or \\ \pi\,|\mathcal{I}_2| \end{array} \right. = \\ &= \pi\left[r_H^2(\varphi_\infty,p,q) - \frac{1}{2}G_{ab}(\varphi_\infty)\,\Sigma^a(\varphi_\infty,p,q)\,\Sigma^b(\varphi_\infty,p,q)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

r_H is the radius of the unique *(event) horizon* of the extremal BH, Σ^a denoting the set of *scalar charges* asymptotically associated to the scalar field φ^a, and G_{ab} is the covariant metric tensor of the scalar manifold (in the real parametrization). Notice that the first line of Eq. (1.3) only contains the definition of R_H^2 itself, whereas the second line of the very same Eq. expresses it through a *moduli-independent* combination of *moduli-dependent* quantities, holding only for the aforementioned $d = 4$ supergravity theories.

Actually, R_H^2 can be expressed as a suitable integral in terms of a *square effective radius* R^2, as follows:

$$R_H^2 = \left. R^2(r,\varphi_\infty,p,q)\right|_{r=\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}G_{ab}(\varphi_\infty)\Sigma^a(\varphi_\infty,p,q)\Sigma^b(\varphi_\infty,p,q)}}^{r=r_H(\varphi_\infty,p,q)}; \tag{1.4}$$

$$R^2(r,\varphi_\infty,p,q) \equiv r^2 - \frac{1}{2}G_{ab}(\varphi_\infty)\,\Sigma^a(\varphi_\infty,p,q)\,\Sigma^b(\varphi_\infty,p,q) \leqslant r^2, \tag{1.5}$$

where r is the usual radial coordinate, and in the last inequality the positive definiteness of G_{ab} was exploited.

It is worth pointing out that the second line of Eq. (1.3) and Eqs. (1.4) and (1.5) are generalizations of the formulæ holding in the so-called *Maxwell-Einstein-axion-dilaton system* (similarly also in the *non-extremal case*, see *e.g.* [77] and [78]; see also the treatment, and in particular Eqs. (2.7), (2.8) and (2.15), of [63]). Notice that in the first of Refs. [77] the variable R is named *physical radial coordinate* (see *e.g.* Eq. (72) therein). Clearly, as the second line of Eq. (1.3), also the definition (1.5) of $R^2(r,\varphi_\infty,p,q)$ holds only for the aforementioned $d = 4$ supergravity theories.

Within the *first order (fake supergravity) formalism* [79], recently used to describe non-BPS attractor flows of $d = 4$ extremal BHs [35, 40], the quantities appearing in the second line of Eq. (1.3) can easily be expressed in terms of a *real "fake superpotential"* $\mathcal{W}(\varphi,p,q)$ as follows (see Eqs. (2.5) and (2.6) below, respectively):

$$r_H(\varphi_\infty,p,q) = \mathcal{W}(\varphi_\infty,p,q); \tag{1.6}$$

$$\Sigma^a(\varphi_\infty,p,q) = 2G^{ab}(\varphi_\infty)\,(\partial_b\mathcal{W})(\varphi_\infty,p,q). \tag{1.7}$$

An explicit expression for $\mathcal{W}$ can be given for the supergravity theories mentioned above [40]. It is worth noticing here that for $\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}}$-BPS *non-degenerate* attractor flows, it simply holds $\mathcal{W}(\varphi,p,q) = |\mathcal{Z}|(\varphi,p,q)$, where $|\mathcal{Z}|$ is the biggest absolute value of the skew-eigenvalues of the *central charge matrix* Z_{AB}, saturating the BPS bound [80].

Eq. (1.3) would seem to yield a *moduli-dependent* expression for R_H^2, but, as we prove explicitly in the present paper, for the class of $d = 4$ ungauged supergravities under consideration it just transpires that the dependence on moduli drops out in the combination $r_H^2 - \frac{1}{2}G_{ab}\Sigma^a\Sigma^b$, when Eqs. (1.6) and (1.7) are taken into account. Summarizing, such a phenomenon happens in the following theories:

- $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to Abelian vector multiplets [75], whose scalar manifold is endowed with a symmetric special Kähler geometry, with the completely symmetric rank-3 tensor $C_{ijk} = 0$, and with U-invariant *quadratic* in BH charges. For such a theory, in [63] Eq. (1.3) has been proved to hold for both $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS and non-BPS ($Z = 0$) attractor flows

- $\mathcal{N} = 3$ supergravity coupled to matter (Abelian vector) multiplets [76], with U-invariant *quadratic* in BH charges

- $\mathcal{N} = 4$ *pure* supergravity [73], with U-invariant *quartic* in BH charges

- $\mathcal{N} = 5$ supergravity [74], with U-invariant *quartic* in BH charges.

It is worth pointing out that $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to one Abelian vector multiplet, corresponding to the $(U(1))^6 \to (U(1))^2$ gauge truncation of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ *pure* supergravity, is nothing but the so-called *Maxwell-Einstein-axion-dilaton system*, studied in [77, 78] and recently discussed in [71] and in [63]. As stated above, the formula (1.3) indeed holds true (actually, with suitable changes, also in the *non-extremal* case).

Furthermore, it is interesting to notice that *all* the above mentioned theories are *all* the $\mathcal{N} \geqslant 2$, $d = 4$ supergravities based on *symmetric* scalar manifolds which do *not* admit an uplift[1] to $d = 5$ space-time dimensions [81].

The present paper is organized as follows.

In Sect. 2 we briefly intoduce the fundamentals of the *first order (fake supergravity) formalism* for the *non-degenerate* attractor flows (both BPS and non-BPS) of extremal BHs in $d = 4$ space-time dimensions.

Sect. 3 is thus devoted to a detailed study of $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $d = 4$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to Abelian vector multiplets. In Subsect. 3.1 the related *Attractor Equations* are explicitly solved, for both the classes of *non-degenerate* critical points of V_{BH}: the $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS one (Subsubsect. 3.1.1) and the non-BPS $Z = 0$ one, this latter with related moduli space (Subsubsect. 3.1.2). By exploiting the *first order (fake supergravity) formalism*, in Subsects. 3.2 and 3.3 the *ADM* (Arnowitt-Deser-Misner) *mass* M_{ADM} [82], *covariant scalar charges* Σ_i and *(square) effective horizon radius* R_H^2 are explicitly computed respectively for $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS and non-BPS $Z = 0$ attractor flows, proving that the second line of Eq. (1.3) holds true. This latter result, already proved in [63], generalizes the findings of [77, 78], also holding in the *non-extremal case*.

Sect. 4 deals with $\mathcal{N} = 3$, $d = 4$ supergravity coupled to matter (Abelian vector) multiplets. In Subsect. 4.1 the related *Attractor Equations* are explicitly solved, for both the classes of *non-degenerate* critical points of V_{BH}: the $\frac{1}{3}$-BPS one (Subsubsect. 4.1.1) and the non-BPS $Z_{AB} = 0$ one (Subsubsect. 4.1.2), both with related moduli space. Once again, by using the *first order (fake supergravity) formalism*, in Subsects. 4.2 and 4.3 the *ADM mass* M_{ADM}, *covariant scalar charges* Σ_i and *(square) effective horizon radius* R_H^2 respectively for $\frac{1}{3}$-BPS and non-BPS $Z_{AB} = 0$ attractor flows are explicitly computed, proving that the second line of Eq. (1.3) holds true also for such a theory. This, as the *minimally coupled* $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity, has a *unique* U-invariant *quadratic* in BH charges.

Comments on the invariance properties of BH entropy in *minimally coupled* $\mathcal{N} = 2$, as well as in *matter-coupled* $\mathcal{N} = 3$, *ungauged* $d = 4$ supergravity are given in Sect. 5.

Next, Sect. 6 deals with $\mathcal{N} = 5$, $d = 4$ supergravity, which does *not* allow for matter coupling and whose field content thus only consists of the gravity multiplet (*pure* theory). In Subsect. 6.1 the related *Attractor Equations* are explicitly solved for the unique class of *non-degenerate* critical points of V_{BH}, namely the $\frac{1}{5}$-BPS one. In Subsubsect. 6.1.1 such a class is studied, along with the related moduli space and Bekenstein-Hawking classical BH entropy [72]. This latter is proportional to the unique U-invariant $\mathcal{I}_4$ of $\mathcal{N} = 5$ supergravity, whose *quartic* expression in terms of the BH charges is also explicitly derived. Through the formal machinery presented in Sect. 2, in Subsect. 6.2 the *ADM mass* M_{ADM}, *covariant scalar charges* Σ_i and *(square) effective horizon radius* R_H^2 for the $\frac{1}{5}$-BPS attractor flow are explicitly given, proving that (the second line of) Eq. (1.3) holds true also for such a theory. This is somewhat surprising because, as mentioned above, $\mathcal{N} = 5$ supergravity, in contrast to the *minimally coupled* $\mathcal{N} = 2$ and *matter-coupled* $\mathcal{N} = 3$ cases, has a *unique* U-invariant *quartic*, rather than *quadratic*, in BH charges.

So, in Sect. 7 the extremal BH attractors in $\mathcal{N} = 4$, $d = 4$ *pure* supergravity are revisited. In Subsect. 7.1 the resolution of the corresponding *Attractor Equation* [71] is reviewed for the unique class of *non-degenerate* critical points of V_{BH}, namely the $\frac{1}{4}$-BPS one. Its corresponding Bekenstein-Hawking classical BH entropy [72] is given by the unique U-invariant $\mathcal{I}_4$ of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ *pure* supergravity, which is also reported. By using the formulæ of Sect. 2, in Subsect. 7.2 the *ADM mass* M_{ADM}, *covariant axion-dilaton charge* Σ_s and *square effective horizon radius* R_H^2 for the $\frac{1}{4}$-BPS attractor flow are explicitly given, proving that the second line of Eq. (1.3) holds true also for such a theory. Also such a result is rather surprising, for the same reason mentioned above: *pure* $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supergravity, as $\mathcal{N} = 5$ theory and in contrast to the *minimally coupled* $\mathcal{N}=2$ and *matter-coupled* $\mathcal{N}=3$ cases, has a *unique* U-invariant *quartic*, rather than *quadratic*, in BH charges.

---

[1] Throughout all the treatment of the present paper, by "uplift to $d = 5$" we mean the dimensional uplift to a $d = 5$ Poincaré supergravity theory, having the same massless degrees of freedom of the original $d = 4$ supergravity.

However, as pointed out in the Introduction, *pure* $\mathcal{N}=4$ and $\mathcal{N}=5$ supergravities are peculiar theories, because their *unique* (*moduli-independent*) U-duality invariant, *quartic* in BH charges, when expressed as a (*unique*) combination of *"dressed"* (*moduli-dependent*) charges, turns out to be a *perfect square* of a *quadratic* expression in the *skew-eigenvalues* $\mathcal{Z}_1$ and $\mathcal{Z}_2$ of the relevant *central charge matrix*. Such a key feature is studied in Sect. 8.

In Sect. 9 we consider *all ungauged* $\mathcal{N}\geqslant 2$, $d=4$ supergravities sharing the same bosonic sector, and thus with the same number of fermion fields, but with *different supersymmetric completions*. Beside the well-known case of the *"duality"* between $\mathcal{N}=2$ $J_3^{\mathbb{H}}$ (*matter-coupled*) and $\mathcal{N}=6$ (*pure*) supergravity (see [25] and Refs. therein), other two cases exist, namely:

- the *"duality"* exhibited by $\mathcal{N}=2$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to 3 Abelian vector multiplets, and $\mathcal{N}=3$ supergravity coupled to 1 matter (Abelian vector) multiplet

- the *"duality"* between $\mathcal{N}=2$ supergravity coupled to 6 Abelian vector multiplets, with scalar manifold given by the symmetric reducible special Kähler manifold $\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}\times\frac{SO(2,6)}{SO(2)\times SO(6)}$, and $\mathcal{N}=4$ supergravity coupled to 2 matter (Abelian vector) multiplets.

It is here worth commenting that such *"dualities"* constitute evidence against the conventional wisdom that bosonic interacting theories have an *unique* supersymmetric extension. The sharing of the same bosonic backgrounds with different supersymmetric completions implies its *"dual"* interpretation with respect to the supersymmetry-preserving properties. Consistent with local supersymmetry, the number of fermion fields is the same in both theories, but with *different* spin/field contents, simply related by the interchange among spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ (*gaugino*) and spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ (*gravitino*) fields.

Sect. 10 contains some comments, outlook and directions for further developments.

Finally, Appendix I concludes the paper. It presents $\mathcal{N}=4$, $d=4$ *ungauged* supergravity coupled to 1 matter (Abelian vector) multiplet (upliftable to the $\mathcal{N}=4$, $d=5$ *pure* theory). This constitutes a counterexample of a theory with *unique* (*moduli-independent*) U-duality invariant *quartic* in BH charges which, when expressed as a combination of *"dressed"* (*moduli-dependent*) charges, does *not* turn out to be a *perfect square* of a *quadratic* expression in the *skew-eigenvalues* of the *central charge matrix* and in the *matter charge(s)*. As a consequence, the explicit expression of R_H^2 given by (the second line of) Eq. (1.3) does *not* hold for such a theory, as well as for all other $d=4$ (ungauged) supergravities not explicitly mentioned above and in the treatment given below.

2 Fake Supergravity Formalism and Effective Horizon Radius for $d=4$ Extremal Black Holes

We recall some facts about the *first order (fake supergravity) formalism* [79] for static, spherically symmetric, asymptotically flat dyonic *extremal* (*i.e.* with $c=0$) BHs in $d=4$, introduced in [35] and [40] (see also [63]).

Let us start with the general formula for the (positive definite) *BH effective potential* of $d=4$ supergravities:

$$V_{BH}=\frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}+Z_I\overline{Z}^I, \tag{2.1}$$

where $Z_{AB}=Z_{[AB]}$ $(A,B=1,...,\mathcal{N})$ is the *central charge matrix*, and Z_I $(I=1,...,n)$ are the *matter charges*, $n\in\mathbb{N}$ being the number of matter multiplets (if any) coupled to the gravity multiplet. Equivalently, in the *first order formalism* (see Eq. (2.23) of [35]):

$$V_{BH}=\mathcal{W}^2+4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(\partial_i\mathcal{W}\right)\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{W}=\mathcal{W}^2+4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(\nabla_i\mathcal{W}\right)\overline{\nabla}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{W}, \tag{2.2}$$

where $\mathcal{W}$ is the moduli-dependent so-called *first order fake superpotential*, and ∇ denotes the relevant covariant differential operator.

An alternative expression for V_{BH} can be given as follows (see Eq. (5.7) of [22]):

$$V_{BH}=e^{\mathcal{G}}\left[1+G^{i\overline{j}}\left(\partial_i\mathcal{G}\right)\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{G}\right]=e^{\mathcal{G}}\left[1+G^{i\overline{j}}\left(\nabla_i\mathcal{G}\right)\overline{\nabla}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{G}\right], \tag{2.3}$$

where now

$$\mathcal{W} \equiv e^{\mathcal{G}/2}. \tag{2.4}$$

By recalling Eq. (65) of [63] and Eqs. (84) and (114) of [63] (which in turn can be traced back to Eq. (29) of [40]), in the same framework the *covariant scalar charges* and the *squared ADM mass* [82] can respectively be written as follows[2]:

$$\Sigma_i = 2\lim_{\tau\to 0^-}\nabla_i\mathcal{W} = 2\lim_{\tau\to 0^-}\partial_i\mathcal{W}; \tag{2.5}$$

$$M^2_{ADM} = r_H^2 = \lim_{\tau\to 0^-}\left[V_{BH} - 4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(\partial_i\mathcal{W}\right)\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{W}\right] = \lim_{\tau\to 0^-}\mathcal{W}^2, \tag{2.6}$$

where $\tau \equiv (r_H - r)^{-1}$. Thence, one can introduce the *(square) effective horizon radius* (recall the notation $R_{+,c=0} = R_{-,c=0} \equiv R_H$; see the treatment of [63]):

$$\begin{aligned} R_H^2 &\equiv \lim_{\tau\to -\infty}V_{BH} = V_{BH}\big|_{\partial V_{BH}=0, V_{BH}\neq 0} = \lim_{\tau\to -\infty}\mathcal{W}^2 = \mathcal{W}^2\big|_{\partial\mathcal{W}=0,\mathcal{W}\neq 0} = \\ &= \frac{A_{eff}(p,q)}{4\pi} = \frac{S_{BH}(p,q)}{\pi}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

where (p,q) denotes the set of magnetic and electric BH charges, A_{eff} (simply named A in the Introduction) is the *effective area* of the BH (*i.e.* the area of the surface pertaining to R_H), S_{BH} is the classical BH entropy, and the *Bekenstein-Hawking entropy-area formula* [72] has been used.

Whenever allowed by the symmetric nature of the scalar manifold, R_H^2 can thus be expressed in terms of a suitable power of the (generally unique) invariant of the relevant representation of the *U-duality group* G, determining the symplectic embedding of the vector field strengths. In $d = 4$ S_{BH} is homogeneous of degree two in (p,q), and only two possibilities arise:

$$R_H^2 = \left|\mathcal{I}_2(p,q)\right|, \ \textit{or}\ R_H^2 = \sqrt{\left|\mathcal{I}_4(p,q)\right|}, \tag{2.8}$$

where $\mathcal{I}_2$ and $\mathcal{I}_4$ respectively denote U-invariants *quadratic* and *quartic* in BH charges.

By exploiting the *τ-monotonicity* of $\mathcal{W}$ (which is indeed an example of *C-function* [17] for *extremal* BHs) [40]:

$$\frac{d\mathcal{W}\left(z(\tau),\overline{z}(\tau);p,q\right)}{d\tau} \geqslant 0, \tag{2.9}$$

the following inequality (holding for $c = 0$) can be obtained [63]:

$$\begin{aligned} M^2_{ADM}(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q) &= \lim_{\tau\to 0^-}\left[V_{BH} - 4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(\partial_i\mathcal{W}\right)\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{W}\right] = \\ &= \lim_{\tau\to 0^-}\mathcal{W}^2 \equiv r_H^2(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q) \\ &\geqslant R_H^2(p,q) = \lim_{\tau\to -\infty}\mathcal{W}^2 = \lim_{\tau\to -\infty}V_{BH}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where the radius r_H of the BH *event horizon* was introduced. More concisely:

$$r_H^2(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q) \geqslant R_H^2(p,q), \ \forall (z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty) \in \mathcal{M}_\infty, \tag{2.11}$$

holding in the whole *asymptotical scalar manifold* $\mathcal{M}_\infty$.

In the *minimally matter-coupled* $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $d = 4$ supergravity based on the sequence of symmetric special Kähler manifolds (*complex Grassmannians*) $\frac{SU(1,n)}{SU(n)\times U(1)}$ [75] (see also the treatment of [63]), as well as in $\mathcal{N} = 3$, *pure* $\mathcal{N} = 4$ and $\mathcal{N} = 5$, $d = 4$ supergravity, it is possible to specialize further the inequality (2.11). Indeed, for such theories it holds that (recall Eq. (1.3), as well as Eqs. (1.4) and (1.5))

$$\begin{aligned} R_H^2(p,q) &\equiv \frac{S_{BH}(p,q)}{\pi} = \\ &= r_H^2(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q) - G_{i\overline{j}}\Sigma^i\overline{\Sigma}^{\overline{j}} = r_H^2(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q) - 4\lim_{\tau\to 0^-}G^{i\overline{j}}\left(\partial_i\mathcal{W}\right)\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{W}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

---

[2] Here and in all our analysis we assume all functions of moduli to be sufficiently regular, in order to allow one to perform smoothly the *radial asymptotical* ($\tau \to 0^-$) *and near horizon* ($\tau \to -\infty$) *limits.*

where in the last step Eq. (2.5) was used. Eq. (2.12), clearly yielding the inequality (2.11) by the presence of non-vanishing scalar charges and the (strict) positive definiteness of $G_{i\overline{j}}$, is nothing but a *many-moduli generalization* of the formula holding for the so-called *(axion-)dilaton extremal BH* [77]. The crucial feature, expressed by Eq. (2.12) and shared by the aforementioned supergravities, is the *disappearance* of the dependence on the *asymptotical moduli* $(z_\infty, \overline{z}_\infty)$ in the combination of quantities $r_H^2 - G_{i\overline{j}}\Sigma^i\overline{\Sigma}^{\overline{j}}$, which separately do depend on moduli[3].

As a generalization of the formula holding (also in the *non-extremal case*) in the *Maxwell-axion-dilaton supergravity* (see *e.g.* [77, 78], and also [63]), in [63] Eq. (2.12) was proved to hold in the *extremal case* for the whole sequence of $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $d = 4$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to Abelian vector multiplets [75], in terms of the (unique) invariant $\mathcal{I}_2$ of the U-duality group $G = SU(1,n)$, which is *quadratic* in charges:

$$R_H^2(p,q) = r_H^2(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q) - 4\lim_{\tau\to 0^-} G^{i\overline{j}}(\partial_i\mathcal{W})\,\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{W} = |\mathcal{I}_2(p,q)|. \qquad (2.13)$$

We will report such results in Subsects. 3.2 and 3.3.

Thence, by exploiting the *first order formalism* for $d = 4$ *extremal* BHs outlined above, we will show that *the same* happens for the following $d = 4$ supergravities:

- $\mathcal{N} = 3$ (*matter-coupled*) [76], as intuitively expected by the strict similarity with the so-called *minimally coupled* $\mathcal{N} = 2$ theory (Subsects. 4.2 and 4.3);
- $\mathcal{N} = 5$ [74], with $|\mathcal{I}_2|$ replaced by $\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_4|}$ (Subsect. 6.2);
- *pure* $\mathcal{N} = 4$ [73], with $|\mathcal{I}_2|$ replaced by $\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_4|}$ (Subsect. 7.2).

Let us here note that while $\mathcal{N} = 5$ theory *cannot be* coupled to matter, in the case $\mathcal{N} = 4$ *matter coupling* is allowed, but Eq. (2.12) holds *only* in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ *pure* supergravity. Having a(n unique) U-invariant $\mathcal{I}_4$ *quartic* in charges, the aforementioned $\mathcal{N} = 4$ and $\mathcal{N} = 5$ theories are pretty different from the *minimally coupled* $\mathcal{N} = 2$ and $\mathcal{N} = 3$, $d = 4$ supergravity, as we will point out in the treatment below.

It is here worth pointing out that in the *non-extremal case* (*i.e.* $c \neq 0$) the expression generalizing Eq. (2.12), namely

$$\begin{aligned} R_+^2(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q) &\equiv \frac{S_{BH,c\neq 0}(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q)}{\pi} \equiv R_+^2(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q) = \\ &= r_+^2(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q) - G_{i\overline{j}}\Sigma^i\overline{\Sigma}^{\overline{j}} \qquad (2.14) \end{aligned}$$

can be only *guessed*, but at present cannot be rigorously proved. Indeed, for static, spherically symmetric, asymptotically flat dyonic *non-extremal* BHs a *first order formalism* is currently unavailable, so there is no way to compute the scalar charges (beside the *direct integration* of the Eqs. of motion of the scalars, as far as we know at present feasible only for the (axion-)dilaton BH [77], and - partially - for *stu* model [54]).

---

[3] $r_H(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q)$ is the radius of the BH event horizon, which is the unique geometrical horizon for *extremal* BHs (in which $c = 0 \Leftrightarrow r_- = r_+ \equiv r_H$; for a recent treatment, see *e.g.* [63]). It depends on the dyonic BH charges p^Λ and q_Λ, but, in presence of *non-vanishing* scalar charges, also on the asymptotical scalar fields $(z_\infty, \overline{z}_\infty)$.

In order to make contact with the *Attractor Mechanism*, and thus to characterize r_H as the *fixed point* of the scalar radial dynamics (in the considered static, spherically symmetric and asymptotically flat *extremal* BH background), one has to evaluate r_H at the peculiar *geometrical locus* in the (asymptotical) moduli space defined by the (*non-degenerate*) criticality condition of V_{BH} (*i.e.* by $\partial V_{BH} = 0$, with $V_{BH}|_{\partial V_{BH}=0} \neq 0$). Eq. (2.5) yields that

$$\Sigma^i(z_H(p,q),\overline{z}_H(p,q),p,q) = 0 \ \ \forall i,$$

where $(z_H(p,q),\overline{z}_H(p,q))$ are defined by

$$[\partial V_{BH}(z,\overline{z},p,q)]_{(z,\overline{z})=(z_H(p,q),\overline{z}_H(p,q))} \equiv 0.$$

Thus, Eqs. (2.6) and (2.7) (or Eq. (2.12)) consistently yield that

$$r_H(z_H(p,q),\overline{z}_H(p,q),p,q) = R_H(p,q).$$

3 $\mathcal{N}=2$ *Minimally Coupled* Supergravity

We consider $\mathcal{N}=2$, $d=4$ ungauged supergravity *minimally coupled (mc)* [75] to n_V Abelian vector multiplets, in the case in which the scalar manifold is given by the sequence of homogeneous symmetric *rank*-1 special Kähler manifolds

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n}=\frac{G_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n}}{H_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n}}=\frac{SU(1,n)}{SU(n)\times U(1)},\ dim_{\mathbb{R}}=2n,\ n=n_V\in\mathbb{N}. \tag{3.1}$$

The $1+n$ vector field strengths and their duals, as well as their asymptotical fluxes, sit in the *fundamental* $\mathbf{1+n}$ representation of the U-duality group $G_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n}=SU(1,n)$, in turn embedded in the symplectic group[4] $Sp(2+2n,\mathbb{R})$.

The general analysis of the Attractor Equations, BH charge orbits and attractor moduli spaces of such a theory has been performed in [25] and [41].

By fixing the Kähler gauge such that $X^0=1$ and in a suitable system of local symplectic *special* coordinates, the geometry of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n}$ is determined by the *holomorphic prepotential function*:

$$\mathcal{F}(z)\equiv-\frac{i}{2}\left[1-\left(z^i\right)^2\right]. \tag{3.2}$$

The Kähler potential of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n}$ can be computed to be ($\Lambda=0,1,...,n$ throughout all the present Section, and $|z|^2\equiv\sum_{i=1}^{n_V}\left|z^i\right|^2$)

$$K\left(z,\overline{z}\right)=-log\left[i\left(\overline{X}^{\Lambda}F_{\Lambda}-X^{\Lambda}\overline{F}_{\Lambda}\right)\right]=-log\left[2\left(1-|z|^2\right)\right], \tag{3.3}$$

yielding the *metric constraint* $1-|z|^2>0$, and the covariant and contravariant metric tensors to be respectively ($G_{i\overline{j}}\left(z,\overline{z}\right)G^{i\overline{k}}\left(z,\overline{z}\right)=\delta_{\overline{j}}^{\overline{k}}$):

$$\begin{aligned} G_{i\overline{j}}\left(z,\overline{z}\right) &= \frac{\left(1-|z|^2\right)\delta_{i\overline{j}}+\overline{z}^{\overline{i}}z^j}{\left(1-|z|^2\right)^2}=2e^K\delta_{i\overline{j}}+4e^{2K}\overline{z}^{\overline{i}}z^j; & (3.4)\\ G^{i\overline{j}}\left(z,\overline{z}\right) &= \left(1-|z|^2\right)\left(\delta^{i\overline{j}}-z^i\overline{z}^{\overline{j}}\right)=\frac{1}{2}e^{-K}\left(\delta^{i\overline{j}}-z^i\overline{z}^{\overline{j}}\right); & (3.5) \end{aligned}$$

From its very definition (see *e.g.* [84], and Refs. therein), the covariantly holomorphic $\mathcal{N}=2$, $d=4$ *central charge function* can be computed to be

$$Z=e^{K/2}W=e^{K/2}\left[q_0+ip^0+\left(q_i-ip^i\right)z^i\right]=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-|z|^2}}\left[q_0+ip^0+\left(q_i-ip^i\right)z^i\right], \tag{3.6}$$

where W is the $\mathcal{N}=2$, $d=4$ *superpotential* (also named *holomorphic central charge function*, with Kähler weights $(2,0)$).

On the other hand, the so-called *matter charges* read

$$\begin{aligned} Z_i &\equiv D_iZ=\partial_iZ+\frac{1}{2}\left(\partial_iK\right)Z=e^{K/2}\left[\partial_iW+\left(\partial_iK\right)W\right]=\\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\left(1-|z|^2\right)^{3/2}}\left[(q_i-ip^i)(1-|z|^2)+(q_0+ip^0)\overline{z}^{\overline{i}}+(q_j-ip^j)z^j\overline{z}^{\overline{i}}\right]. \qquad (3.7) \end{aligned}$$

Here, D denotes the $U(1)$-Kähler and $H_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n}$-covariant differential operator. Due to the global vanishing of the C_{ijk}-tensor of special Kähler geometry, there are only two ($U(1)$-Kähler-) and $H_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n}$-invariants, namely

$$\alpha_1 \equiv |Z|; \tag{3.8}$$

$$\alpha_2 \equiv \sqrt{Z_i\overline{Z}^{i}}=\sqrt{G^{i\overline{j}}Z_i\overline{Z}_{\overline{j}}}=\sqrt{G^{i\overline{j}}\left(D_iZ\right)\overline{D}_{\overline{j}}\overline{Z}}, \tag{3.9}$$

---

[4] In all our analysis we consider the (semi)classical limit of *continuous* (*unquantized*), large BH charges.

both *(homogeneous) of degree* 1 in BH charges (p, q) (in particular, square roots of quantities *quadratic* in (p, q)). By a suitable rotation of $U(n)$, the vector Z_i of *matter charges* can be chosen real and pointing in a given direction, *e.g.*

$$Z_i = \sqrt{Z_j \overline{Z}^j}\,\delta_{i1} = \alpha_2 \delta_{i1}. \tag{3.10}$$

As recalled at the start of the next Subsection, only ($\frac{1}{2}$-)BPS and non-BPS ($Z = 0$) attractor flows are *non-degenerate* (*i.e.* corresponding to *large* BHs, see below) [25], and the corresponding (squared) *first order fake superpotentials* are ([40]; recall Eq. (4.3) and (4.5), respectively)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}^2_{\left(\frac{1}{2}-\right)BPS} &= |Z|^2 = \alpha_1^2 = \\ &= \frac{\left[q_0 + ip^0 + \left(q_i - ip^i\right) z^i\right]\left[q_0 - ip^0 + \left(q_j + ip^j\right) \overline{z}^{\overline{j}}\right]}{2\left(1 - |z|^2\right)}; \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}^2_{non-BPS(,Z=0)} &= G^{i\overline{j}} \left(D_i Z\right) \overline{D}_{\overline{j}} \overline{Z} = \alpha_2^2 = \\ &= \frac{1}{2\left(1 - |z|^2\right)^2} \left(\delta^{i\overline{j}} - z^i \overline{z}^{\overline{j}}\right) \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot \left[(q_i - ip^i)(1 - |z|^2) + (q_0 + ip^0)\overline{z}^{\overline{i}} + (q_r - ip^r) z^r \overline{z}^{\overline{i}}\right] \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot \left[(q_j + ip^j)(1 - |z|^2) + (q_0 - ip^0) z^j + (q_n + ip^n) \overline{z}^{\overline{n}} z^j\right], \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where use of Eqs. (3.6) and (3.7) was made.

3.1 Attractor Equations and their Solutions

The *BH effective potential* can be written as

$$V_{BH} = |Z|^2 + G^{i\overline{j}} \left(D_i Z\right) \overline{D}_{\overline{j}} \overline{Z} = \alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2. \tag{3.13}$$

The $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $d = 4$ *Attractor Eqs.* in the case of *minimal coupling* to Abelian vector multiplets are nothing but the *criticality conditions* for such an $H_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n}$-invariant (and Kähler-gauge-invariant) quantity. Such criticality conditions are satisfied for two classes of critical points :

- ($\frac{1}{2}$-)BPS:
$$D_i Z = 0 \ \forall i = 1, ..., n \Leftrightarrow \alpha_2 = 0, \ Z \neq 0; \tag{3.14}$$
- non-supersymmetric (non-BPS with $Z = 0$) :
$$D_i Z \neq 0 \ (\textit{at least} \text{ for some } i), \ Z = 0 \Leftrightarrow \alpha_1 = 0. \tag{3.15}$$

It is worth counting here the degrees of freedom related to Eqs. (3.14) and (3.15). The $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS criticality conditions (3.14) are n *complex* independent ones, thus *all* scalars are stabilized by such conditions. On the other hand, there is only one *complex* non-BPS $Z = 0$ criticality condition (3.15). This fact paves the way to the possibility to have a *moduli space* of non-BPS $Z = 0$ attractors, spanned by the $n - 1$ *complex* scalars unstabilized by Eq. (3.15); this actually holds true [41], as it will be explicitly found below for the first time (see Subsection 3.1.2).

3.1.1 $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS Attractors

An *algebraic*, equivalent approach to the direct resolution of the n *complex* $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS criticality conditions (3.14) is based on the resolution of the *special Kähler geometry identities* evaluated along the *geometrical* *locus* in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=2,quadr.,n}$ defined by the constraints (3.14). By following such an approach, the electric and magnetic BH charges are constrained as follows [2]:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} p^{\Lambda} = ie^{K/2}(\overline{Z}X^{\Lambda} - Z\overline{X}^{\Lambda}); \\ \\ q_{\Lambda} = ie^{K/2}(\overline{Z}F_{\Lambda} - Z\overline{F}_{\Lambda}). \end{array}\right. \tag{3.16}$$

Summing such two sets of symplectic-covariant Eqs., one gets

$$X^{\Lambda}q_{\Sigma} - p^{\Lambda}F_{\Sigma} = ie^{K/2}Z(\overline{X}^{\Lambda}F_{\Sigma} - X^{\Lambda}\overline{F}_{\Sigma}), \tag{3.17}$$

in which the scalars z^i and $\overline{z}^{\overline{i}}$ and the *central charge function* Z are understood to be evaluated at the BH horizon. Thence, we can proceed to solve for the scalars, *stabilized* at the BH horizon in terms of the BH charges; by rewriting Eqs. (3.17) in components, one achieves the following result:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (\Lambda,\Sigma) & = & (0,0): q_0 + ip^0 = 2\ e^{K/2}Z; \\ (\Lambda,\Sigma) & = & (0,i): q_i - iz^ip^0 = -\ e^{K/2}Z(z^i + \overline{z}^{\overline{i}}); \\ (\Lambda,\Sigma) & = & (i,0): z^iq_0 + ip^i = e^{K/2}Z(z^i + \overline{z}^{\overline{i}}); \\ (\Lambda,\Sigma) & = & (i,i): z^i(q_i - ip^i) = -2e^{K/2}Z|z|^2. \end{array} \tag{3.18}$$

The *decoupling* of such $2n_V + 2$ *real* algebraic Eqs. in terms of the n_V *complex* unknowns z^i (the two additional real degrees of freedom residing in the *homogeneity* of degree 1 of the system (3.18) in BH charges) allows for an effortless resolution, yielding the following explicit expression of the n complex scalars determining the $\frac{1}{2}$*-BPS attractor scalar horizon configurations*:

$$z^i_{BPS} = -\frac{\left(q_i + ip^i\right)}{q_0 - ip^0},\ \forall i = 1,...,n. \tag{3.19}$$

Notice that *all* n_V complex scalars z^i are stabilized in terms of the BH charges, and thus, as well known, no classical moduli space for $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS attractors exists at all. By recalling Eqs. (1.2) and (3.13), and plugging Eqs. (3.19) into Eqs. (3.6) and (3.7), one obtains that

$$\frac{S_{BH,BPS}}{\pi} = \frac{A_{H,BPS}}{4} = V_{BH}|_{BPS} = \alpha^2_{1,BPS} = |Z|^2_{BPS} = \mathcal{I}_2 > 0, \tag{3.20}$$

where $\mathcal{I}_2$ is the (unique) invariant of the *fundamental/anti-fundamental* $\left(\mathbf{1+n}, \overline{\mathbf{1+n}}\right)$ representation of the U-duality group $G_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n}$ (not *irreducible* with respect to $G_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n}$ itself), *quadratic* in BH charges (see Eq. (5.1) below):

$$\mathcal{I}_2 = \frac{1}{2}\left[q_0^2 - q_i^2 + \left(p^0\right)^2 - \left(p^i\right)^2\right] = \frac{1}{2}\left(q^2 + p^2\right), \tag{3.21}$$

where $q^2 \equiv \eta^{\Lambda\Sigma}q_{\Lambda}q_{\Sigma}$ and $p^2 \equiv \eta_{\Lambda\Sigma}p^{\Lambda}p^{\Sigma}$, $\eta^{\Lambda\Sigma} = \eta_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ being the $(1+n)$-dim. Lorentzian metric with signature $(+,-,...,-)$ (see the discussion in Sect. 5). In terms of the dressed charges Z and D_iZ, the (*only apparently* moduli-dependent) expression of $\mathcal{I}_2$ reads (see *e.g.* [25]):

$$\mathcal{I}_2 = |Z|^2 - G^{i\overline{j}}\left(D_iZ\right)\overline{D}_{\overline{j}}\overline{Z} = \alpha_1^2 - \alpha_2^2. \tag{3.22}$$

It can be explicitly checked that z^i_{BPS} given by Eqs. (3.19) satisfy the *metric constraint* $1 - \left|z^i\right|^2 > 0$ (yielded by Eq. (3.3)).

It is well known that $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS critical points of V_{BH} are *stable*, *at least* as far as the metric $G_{i\overline{j}}$ of the special Kähler scalar manifold is positive definite (at such points); indeed, the $2n_V \times 2n_V$ (covariant)

Hessian matrix $\mathcal{H}^{V_{BH}}_{BPS}$ of V_{BH} at its $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS critical points has rank $2n_V$, and it reads [4]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}^{V_{BH}}_{BPS} &= 2\left|Z\right|^2_{BPS}\left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & G_{i\bar{j}} \\ & \\ G_{j\bar{i}} & 0 \end{array}\right)_{BPS} = \left[q_0^2 - q_k^2 + \left(p^0\right)^2 - \left(p^k\right)^2\right]\cdot \\
&\cdot\left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & e^{K_{BPS}}\delta_{i\bar{j}} + e^{2K_{BPS}}\overline{z}_{i,BPS}z_{\bar{j},BPS} \\ & \\ e^{K_{BPS}}\delta_{j\bar{i}} + e^{2K_{BPS}}\overline{z}_{j,BPS}z_{\bar{i},BPS} & 0 \end{array}\right),
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.23}
$$

where use of the stabilization Eqs. (3.19) was made.

3.1.2 Non-BPS ($Z = 0$) Attractors and their Moduli Space

As yielded by Eqs. (3.15), non-BPS ($Z = 0$) attractor solutions are given by $D_iZ \neq 0$ for *at least* some $i \in \{1, ..., n_V\}$, and by the vanishing of the central charge Z, which in the considered theory reads as follows (within the *metric constraint* $1 - |z|^2 > 0$; recall Eq. (3.6)):

$$
Z = 0 \Leftrightarrow q_0 + ip^0 = -\left(q_i - ip^i\right)z^i_{non-BPS}.
\tag{3.24}
$$

As noticed above,this is one *complex* Eq. in terms of n_V *complex* unknowns z^i, thus at most *only one* of them will be stabilized in terms of the BH charges. Indeed, one can choose, without any loss of generality, to solve Eq. (3.24) for z^1, getting $(\widehat{i} = 2, ..., n_V)$:

$$
z^1_{non-BPS} = -\frac{\left(q_{\widehat{i}} - ip^{\widehat{i}}\right)z^{\widehat{i}}_{non-BPS}}{q_1 - ip^1} - \frac{q_0 + ip^0}{q_1 - ip^1}.
\tag{3.25}
$$

The remaining scalars $z^{\widehat{i}}$ are *not stabilized* at the considered (*non-degenerate*) non-BPS $Z = 0$ critical points of V_{BH}. As known from group-theoretical arguments (see Table 3 of [41]), such scalars span a moduli space given by the *rank*-1 symmetric special Kähler manifold

$$
\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n,non-BPS} = \frac{SU(1, n-1)}{SU(n-1) \times U(1)} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n-1}, dim_{\mathbb{R}} = 2(n-1).
\tag{3.26}
$$

The unique element of the sequence $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, in which the non-BPS $Z = 0$ attractors have no associated moduli space is the $n = 1$ case (the so-called t^2 model), in which all *non-degenerate* critical points of V_{BH} are stable, with no "flat" directions at all.

The existence of $n - 1$ "flat" directions at all orders in the (covariant) differentiation of V_{BH} at its *non-degenerate* non-BPS $Z = 0$ critical points in the considered theory can be realized also by the following argument.

Firstly, it can be explicitly computed that the application of an odd number of covariant differential operators on V_{BH} always yields a vanishing result (here the tilded indices can be either holomorphic or anti-holomorphic; $m \in \mathbb{N}$ throughout):

$$
\left(D_{\tilde{i}_1}D_{\tilde{i}_2}...D_{\tilde{i}_{2m-1}}V_{BH}\right)_{non-BPS} = 0.
\tag{3.27}
$$

Thence, the $2n_V \times 2n_V$ (covariant) Hessian matrix $\mathcal{H}^{V_{BH}}_{non-BPS}$ of V_{BH} at its non-BPS $Z = 0$ critical points can be computed to be:

$$
\mathcal{H}^{V_{BH}}_{non-BPS} = 2\left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & \left(D_iZ\right)\overline{D}_{\bar{j}}\overline{Z} \\ & \\ \left(D_jZ\right)\overline{D}_{\bar{i}}\overline{Z} & 0 \end{array}\right)_{non-BPS},
\tag{3.28}
$$

and it has thus rank 2, with 2 strictly positive and $2n_V - 2$ vanishing real eigenvalues (*massless* "Hessian modes").

In order to investigate the persistence of such $2n_V - 2$ *massless* "Hessian modes" to higher order in the covariant differentiation of V_{BH}, one can define a *"putative" mass matrix* $\mathcal{H}_m^{V_{BH}}$ for scalars, such that $\mathcal{H}_{m=0}^{V_{BH}} = \mathcal{H}^{V_{BH}}$ (covariant Hessian matrix of V_{BH}), in the following way:

$$\mathcal{H}_m^{V_{BH}} \equiv \left(D_{\widetilde{i}} D_{\widetilde{j}} D_{\widetilde{i}_1} ... D_{\widetilde{i}_{2m}} V_{BH} \right) Z^{\widetilde{i}_1} ... Z^{\widetilde{i}_{2m}}, \tag{3.29}$$

where $Z^{\widetilde{i}}$ denotes the relevant contravariant *matter charge*. It can be thus calculated that

$$\mathcal{H}_{m,non-BPS}^{V_{BH}} = 2^{2m} \left(V_{BH,non-BPS} \right)^m \mathcal{H}_{non-BPS}^{V_{BH}}. \tag{3.30}$$

Therefore, regardless of m the *"putative" mass matrix* $\mathcal{H}_m^{V_{BH}}$ has rank 2, with 2 strictly positive and $2n_V - 2$ vanishing real eigenvalues, and these latter thus span a moduli space.

By recalling Eq. (3.7) and plugging Eq. (3.24) into the *matter charges* $D_i Z$, one obtains:

$$\left. D_i Z \right|_{non-BPS} = \frac{q_i - ip^i}{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{1 - \left| z \right|_{non-BPS}^2}}. \tag{3.31}$$

By such a result, $\mathcal{H}_{non-BPS}^{V_{BH}}$ can be rewritten as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}_{non-BPS}^{V_{BH}} = \frac{1}{1 - \left| z \right|_{non-BPS}^2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \left(q_i - ip^i \right) \left(q_j + ip^j \right) \\ \left(q_j - ip^j \right) \left(q_i + ip^i \right) & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.32}$$

Due to Eqs. (3.24) and (3.25), in general the *matter charges* $D_i Z$ and $\mathcal{H}^{V_{BH}}$ are not stabilized in terms of the BH charges at the considered non-BPS $Z = 0$ critical points, but nevertheless this does *not* affect the *moduli-independence* of the BH entropy. Indeed, by recalling Eqs. (1.2) and (3.13), and plugging Eqs. (3.15) and (3.24) into Eqs. (3.6) and (3.7), one obtains that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{S_{BH,non-BPS}}{\pi} &= \frac{A_{H,non-BPS}}{4} = \left. V_{BH} \right|_{non-BPS} = \alpha_{2,non-BPS}^2 = \\ &= \left[G^{i\overline{j}} \left(D_i Z \right) \overline{D}_{\overline{j}} \overline{Z} \right]_{non-BPS} = \left[G^{i\overline{j}} \left(\partial_i Z \right) \overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}} \overline{Z} \right]_{non-BPS} = \\ &= -\mathcal{I}_2 > 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

where $\mathcal{I}_2$ is the (unique) *quadratic* $G_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n}$-invariant given by Eqs. (3.21) and(3.22).

Thus, in $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $d = 4$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to Abelian vector multiplets, the BH charges supporting *non-degenerate* critical points of V_{BH} are split in two branches: the ($\frac{1}{2}$-)BPS one, defined by $\mathcal{I}_2 > 0$, and the non-BPS ($Z = 0$) one, corresponding to $\mathcal{I}_2 < 0$.

3.2 Black Hole Parameters for $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS Flow

By using the explicit expressions of $\mathcal{W}_{BPS}^2$ given by Eq. (6.32), using the differential relations of special Kähler geometry of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n}$ (see *e.g.* [84], and Refs. therein), and exploiting the *first order (fake supergravity) formalism* discussed in Sect. 2, one respectively obtains the following expressions of the *(square) ADM mass*, *covariant scalar charges* and *(square) effective horizon radius* for the $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS attractor flow[5] [63]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
r^2_{H,BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right) &= M^2_{ADM,BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right)=\mathcal{W}^2_{BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right)=\\
&= \lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}\left|Z\right|^2\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)=\\
&= \frac{\left[q_0+ip^0+\left(q_i-ip^i\right)z^i_\infty\right]\left[q_0-ip^0+\left(q_j+ip^j\right)\overline{z}^{\overline{j}}_\infty\right]}{2\left(1-\left|z_\infty\right|^2\right)}; \qquad (3.34)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{i,BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right) &= 2\lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}\left(\partial_i\mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)=\\
&= \frac{1}{M_{ADM,BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right)}\lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}\left(\overline{Z}D_iZ\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)=\\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\left(1-\left|z_\infty\right|^2\right)^{3/2}}\sqrt{\frac{q_0-ip^0+\left(q_j+ip^j\right)\overline{z}^{\overline{j}}_\infty}{q_0+ip^0+\left(q_k-ip^k\right)z^k_\infty}}\cdot\\
&\quad\cdot\left[(q_i-ip^i)(1-|z_\infty|^2)+(q_0+ip^0)\overline{z}^{\overline{i}}_\infty+(q_r-ip^r)z^r_\infty\overline{z}^{\overline{i}}_\infty\right]; \qquad (3.35)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
R^2_{H,BPS} &= \lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathcal{W}^2_{BPS}\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)+\\
-4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right)\right)\left(\partial_i\mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)\cdot\\
\cdot\left(\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)
\end{array}\right]=\\
&= \mathcal{I}_2\left(p,q\right)=V_{BH,BPS}=\frac{S_{BH,BPS}\left(p,q\right)}{\pi}. \qquad (3.36)
\end{aligned}
$$

Eq. (3.36) proves Eq. (2.13) for the $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS attractor flow of the $\mathcal{N}=2$, $d=4$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to $n\equiv n_V$ Abelian vector multiplets.

Notice that in the extremality regime ($c=0$) the *effective horizon radius* R_H, and thus A_H and the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy S_{BH} are *independent* on the particular vacuum or ground state of the considered theory, *i.e.* on $\left(z^i_\infty,\overline{z}^{\overline{i}}_\infty\right)$, but rather they depend *only* on the electric and magnetic charges q_Λ and p^Λ, which are *conserved* due to the overall $\left(U(1)\right)^{n+1}$ gauge-invariance. The independence on $\left(z^i_\infty,\overline{z}^{\overline{i}}_\infty\right)$ is of crucial importance for the consistency of the *microscopic state counting interpretation* of S_{BH}, as well as for the overall consistency of the macroscopic thermodynamic picture of the BH. However, it is worth recalling that the ADM mass M_{ADM} generally does depend on $\left(z^i_\infty,\overline{z}^{\overline{i}}_\infty\right)$ *also in the extremal case*, as yielded by Eq. (3.34) for the considered $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS attractor flow.

Furthermore, Eq. (3.34) yields that the $\frac{1}{2}$-BPS attractor flow of the $\mathcal{N}=2$, $d=4$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to $n\equiv n_V$ Abelian vector multiplets does *not* saturate the *marginal stability bound* (see [83] and [54]).

---

[5] Throughout the whole paper, for *all* the considered functions $f\left(z,\overline{z},p,q\right)$ we assume:

$$
\left(f\left(z,\overline{z},p,q\right)\right)_\infty\equiv\lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}f\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)=f\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right).
$$

Furthermore, we assume $f\left(z,\overline{z},p,q\right)$ to be *smooth* enough to split the *asymptotical limit* of a product into the product of the *asymptotical limits* of the factors.

3.3 Black Hole Parameters for Non-BPS $(Z = 0)$ Flow

By using the explicit expressions of $\mathcal{W}^2_{non-BPS}$ given by Eq. (3.12), using the differential relations of special Kähler geometry of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=2,mc,n}$ (see *e.g.* [84] and Refs. therein), and exploiting the *first order (fake supergravity) formalism* discussed in Sect. 2, one respectively obtains the following expressions of the *(square) ADM mass*, *covariant scalar charges* and *(square) effective horizon radius* for the non-BPS $Z = 0$ attractor flow [63]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
r^2_{H,non-BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right) &= M^2_{ADM,non-BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right) = \mathcal{W}^2_{non-BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right) = \\
&= \lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}\left[G^{i\overline{j}}\left(D_iZ\right)\overline{D}_{\overline{j}}\overline{Z}\right]\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right) = \\
&= \frac{1}{2\left(1-\left|z_\infty\right|^2\right)^2}\left(\delta^{i\overline{j}}-z^i_\infty\overline{z}^{\overline{j}}_\infty\right)\cdot \\
&\quad\cdot\left[(q_i-ip^i)(1-\left|z_\infty\right|^2)+(q_0+ip^0)\overline{z}^{\overline{i}}_\infty+(q_r-ip^r)z^r_\infty\overline{z}^{\overline{i}}_\infty\right]\cdot \\
&\quad\cdot\left[(q_j+ip^j)(1-\left|z_\infty\right|^2)+(q_0-ip^0)z^j_\infty+(q_n+ip^n)\overline{z}^{\overline{n}}_\infty z^j_\infty\right];
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.37}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{i,non-BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right) &= 2\lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}\left(\partial_i\mathcal{W}_{non-BPS}\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right) = \\
&= \frac{1}{M_{ADM,non-BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right)}\lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}\left(\overline{Z}D_iZ\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right) = \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{(1-\left|z_\infty\right|^2)}\cdot \\
&\quad\cdot\left[q_0-ip^0+\left(q_j+ip^j\right)\overline{z}^{\overline{j}}_\infty\right]\cdot \\
&\quad\cdot\left[(q_i-ip^i)(1-\left|z_\infty\right|^2)+(q_0+ip^0)\overline{z}^{\overline{i}}_\infty+(q_m-ip^m)z^m_\infty\overline{z}^{\overline{i}}_\infty\right]\cdot \\
&\quad\cdot\left[\begin{array}{l}
\left(\delta^{n\overline{p}}-z^n_\infty\overline{z}^{\overline{p}}_\infty\right)\cdot \\
\cdot\left[(q_n-ip^n)(1-\left|z_\infty\right|^2)+(q_0+ip^0)\overline{z}^{\overline{n}}_\infty+(q_s-ip^s)z^s_\infty\overline{z}^{\overline{n}}_\infty\right]\cdot \\
\cdot\left[(q_p+ip^p)(1-\left|z_\infty\right|^2)+(q_0-ip^0)z^p_\infty+(q_w+ip^w)\overline{z}^{\overline{w}}_\infty z^p_\infty\right]
\end{array}\right]^{-1/2}
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.38}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
R^2_{H,non-BPS} &= \lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathcal{W}^2_{non-BPS}\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)+ \\
-4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right)\right)\left(\partial_i\mathcal{W}_{non-BPS}\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)\cdot \\
\cdot\left(\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{W}_{non-BPS}\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)
\end{array}\right] = \\
&= -\mathcal{I}_2\left(p,q\right) = V_{BH,non-BPS} = \frac{S_{BH,non-BPS}\left(p,q\right)}{\pi}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.39}
$$

Eq. (3.39) proves Eq. (2.13) for the non-BPS $Z = 0$ attractor flow of the the $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $d = 4$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to $n \equiv n_V$ Abelian vector multiplets. The considerations made at the end of Subsect. 3.2 hold also for the considered attractor flow.

It is worth noticing out that Eqs. (3.36) and (3.39) are consistent, because, as pointed out above, the ($\frac{1}{2}$-)BPS- and non-BPS ($Z = 0$)- supporting BH charge configurations in the considered theory are respectively defined by the *quadratic* constraints $\mathcal{I}_2(p,q) > 0$ and $\mathcal{I}_2(p,q) < 0$.

As yielded by Eqs. (3.35) and (3.38) for both *non-degenerate* attractor flows of the considered theory it holds the following relation among *scalar charges* and *ADM mass*:

$$\Sigma_i = \frac{1}{M_{ADM}} \lim_{\tau \to 0^-} D_i \left(|Z|^2 \right). \tag{3.40}$$

Furthermore, Eq. (3.37) yields that the non-BPS $Z = 0$ attractor flow of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $d = 4$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to $n \equiv n_V$ Abelian vector multiplets does *not* saturate the *marginal stability bound* (see [83] and [54]).

As it will be proved in the next Sections, for *all* non-degenerate attractor flows of the considered $d = 4$ supergravities the *marginal stability bound* is *not* saturated. A more detailed discussion of such an issue falls beyond the scope of the present investigation, and it will be given elsewhere [85].

4 $\mathcal{N} = 3$ Supergravity

The (Kähler) scalar manifold is [76]

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=3,n} = \frac{G_{\mathcal{N}=3,n}}{H_{\mathcal{N}=3,n}} = \frac{SU(3,n)}{SU(3) \times SU(n) \times U(1)}, \ dim_{\mathbb{R}} = 6n. \tag{4.1}$$

The $3 + n$ vector field strengths and their duals, as well as their asymptotical fluxes, sit in the *fundamental* $\mathbf{3+n}$ representation of the U-duality group $G_{\mathcal{N}=3,n} = SU(3,n)$, in turn embedded in the symplectic group $Sp(6+2n,\mathbb{R})$.

$Z_{AB} = Z_{[AB]}$ ($A, B = 1, 2, 3 = \mathcal{N}$) is the *central charge matrix*, and Z_I ($I = 1, ..., n$) are the *matter charges*, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is the number of matter (Abelian vector) multiplets coupled to the gravity multiplet. By a suitable transformation of the $\mathcal{R}$-symmetry $U(3)$, Z_{AB} can be *skew-diagonalized* by putting it in the *normal form* (see e.g. [40] and Refs. therein):

$$Z_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{Z}_1 \epsilon & \\ & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.2}$$

where ϵ is the 2×2 symplectic metric, and $\mathcal{Z}_1 \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ is the unique $\mathcal{N} = 3$ (moduli-dependent) *skew-eigenvalue*, which can be expressed in term of the unique $U(3)$(and also $H_{\mathcal{N}=3,n} = U(3) \times U(n)$)-invariant as follows:

$$\mathcal{Z}_1 = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} Z_{AB} \overline{Z}^{AB}}. \tag{4.3}$$

On the other hand, by a suitable rotation of $U(n)$, the vector Z_I of matter charges can be chosen real and pointing in a given direction, *e.g.*

$$Z_I = \rho \delta_{I1}, \tag{4.4}$$

where ρ can be expressed the unique $U(n)$(and also $H_{\mathcal{N}=3,n} = U(3) \times U(n)$)-invariant as:

$$\rho = \sqrt{Z_I \overline{Z}^I}. \tag{4.5}$$

The simplest holomorphic parametrization of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=3,n}$ can be written in terms of the $(3+n) \times (3+n)$ coset representative [86, 87]

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{1 + XX^\dagger} & X \\ X^\dagger & \sqrt{1 + X^\dagger X} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.6}$$

where X is a complex $n \times 3$ matrix in the bi-fundamental of $SU(3) \times SU(n) = H_{\mathcal{N}=3,n} \backslash U(1)$, whose component are nothing but the $3n$ complex scalars z^i ($i = 1, ..., 3n$) spanning $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=3,n}$. The embedding of $G_{\mathcal{N}=3,n}$ into the symplectic group $Sp(6+2n,\mathbb{R})$:

$$SU(3,n) \to Sp(6+2n,\mathbb{R}) \ , \ g \equiv L(z) \to S(g) \equiv S(L(z)) \ , \tag{4.7}$$

is determined by the $(6+2n)\times(6+2n)$ matrix

$$S(g)=\begin{pmatrix}\phi_0 & \overline{\phi_1}\\ \phi_1 & \overline{\phi_0}\end{pmatrix}\in SU(3,n)\subset Sp\left(6+2n,\mathbb{R}\right), \tag{4.8}$$

such that the $(3+n)\times(3+n)$ sub-blocks ϕ_0 and ϕ_1 satisfy the relations

$$\phi_0^\dagger\phi_0-\phi_1^\dagger\phi_1=1\ ,\ \phi_0^\dagger\overline{\phi_1}-\phi_1^\dagger\overline{\phi_0}=0\ . \tag{4.9}$$

Let us here recall that in the *Gaillard-Zumino formalism* [88], the vector kinetic matrix can be written as ($\Lambda=1,2,3,4,...,3+n$ throughout all the present Section)

$$\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}=(\phi_0^\dagger+\phi_1^\dagger)^{-1}(\phi_0^\dagger-\phi_1^\dagger)\ . \tag{4.10}$$

The embedding $SU(3,n)\to Sp\left(6+2n,\mathbb{R}\right)$ is determined once S is written as a functions of $X\left(z\right)$, namely

$$S\left(X\right)=\left(\begin{array}{cc|cc}\sqrt{1+XX^\dagger} & 0 & 0 & X\\ 0 & \sqrt{1+X^T\overline{X}} & X^T & 0\\ \hline 0 & \overline{X} & \sqrt{1+\overline{X}X^T} & 0\\ X^T & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{1+X^\dagger X}\end{array}\right), \tag{4.11}$$

that is

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_1 &= \begin{pmatrix}0 & \overline{X}\\ X^\dagger & 0\end{pmatrix}; &(4.12)\\ \phi_0 &= \sqrt{1+\overline{\phi}_1\phi_1}=\begin{pmatrix}\sqrt{1+XX^\dagger} & 0\\ 0 & \sqrt{1+X^T\overline{X}}\end{pmatrix}. &(4.13)\end{aligned}$$

The vector kinetic matrix $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ can be written in terms of the $(3+n)\times(3+n)$ symplectic sections (and their inverse) as follows (see *e.g.* [84], and Refs. therein):

$$\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}=h_{\Omega\Lambda}\left(f^{-1}\right)_{\Sigma}^{\ \Omega}. \tag{4.14}$$

The explicit dependence of the symplectic sections on the sub-blocks of $S\left(X\right)$ is simply

$$h_{\Lambda\Sigma}=-\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\phi_0-\phi_1\right),\ f_{\Sigma}^{\Lambda}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\phi_0+\phi_1\right), \tag{4.15}$$

whereas in terms of the matrix $X\left(z\right)$ they read

$$\begin{aligned}h_{\Lambda\Sigma} &= -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix}\sqrt{1+XX^\dagger} & -\overline{X}\\ -X^\dagger & \sqrt{1+X^T\overline{X}}\end{pmatrix}\equiv\left(h_{\Lambda|AB},\overline{h}_{\Lambda|I}\right)\equiv\mathbf{h}; &(4.16)\\ f_{\Sigma}^{\Lambda} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix}\sqrt{1+XX^\dagger} & \overline{X}\\ X^\dagger & \sqrt{1+X^T\overline{X}}\end{pmatrix}\equiv\left(f_{AB}^{\Lambda},\overline{f}_{\overline{I}}^{\Lambda}\right)\equiv\mathbf{f}. &(4.17)\end{aligned}$$

By rewriting Eqs. (4.9) in terms of the symplectic sections, one finds [89, 90]

$$\begin{aligned}i\left(\mathbf{f}^\dagger\mathbf{h}-\mathbf{h}^\dagger\mathbf{f}\right) &= 1; &(4.18)\\ \mathbf{h}^T\mathbf{f}-\mathbf{h}\mathbf{f}^T &= 0. &(4.19)\end{aligned}$$

The *central charge matrix* Z_{AB} and the *matter charges* Z_I are respectively defined as the integral over the 2-sphere at infinity S_∞^2 of the *dressed* graviphoton and matter field strengths [89, 90, 91]:

$$\begin{aligned}Z_{AB} &\equiv -\int_{S_\infty^2}T_{AB}=-\int_{S_\infty^2}T_{AB}^{-}=f_{AB}^{\Lambda}q_\Lambda-h_{\Lambda|AB}p^\Lambda\ ; &(4.20)\\ Z_I &\equiv -\int_{S_\infty^2}T_I=-\int_{S_\infty^2}T_I^{-}=f_I^{\Lambda}q_\Lambda-h_{\Lambda|I}p^\Lambda\ . &(4.21)\end{aligned}$$

Using the explicit expression for the symplectic sections given in Eqs. (4.16) and (4.17), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{AB} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[\left(\sqrt{1+XX^{\dagger}}\right)_{AB}^{\ \ C}(q_C+ip^C)+\overline{X}^{i}_{AB}(q_i-ip^i)\right] \ ; \qquad (4.22)\\ Z_I &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[(X^{\dagger})^{A}_{I}(q_A-ip^A)+\left(\sqrt{1+X^T\overline{X}}\right)_{I}^{\ \ i}(q_i+ip^i)\right] \ . \qquad (4.23) \end{aligned}$$

As recalled at the start of the next Subsection, only ($\frac{1}{3}$-)BPS and non-BPS ($Z_{AB}=0$) attractor flows are *non-degenerate* (*i.e.* corresponding to *large* BHs), and the corresponding (square) *first order fake superpotentials* are ([40]; recall Eq. (4.3) and (4.5), respectively)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}^2_{\left(\frac{1}{3}-\right)BPS} &= \frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}=\mathcal{Z}_1^2= \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left[\begin{array}{l} \left[(q_C-ip^C)\left(\sqrt{1+XX^{\dagger}}\right)^{\ C}+(q_i+ip^i)\left(X^T\right)^i\right]\cdot \\ \cdot\left[\left(\sqrt{1+XX^{\dagger}}\right)^{\ D}(q_D+ip^D)+\overline{X}^j(q_j-ip^j)\right] \end{array}\right]= \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left[\begin{array}{l} (1+XX^{\dagger})^{AB}(q_A-ip^A)(q_B+ip^B)+ \\ +(\sqrt{1+XX^{\dagger}}\,X)^{A\,i}(q_i+ip^i)(q_A+ip^A)+ \\ +(X^{\dagger}\sqrt{1+XX^{\dagger}})^{j\,B}(q_A-ip^B)(q_j-ip^j)+ \\ +(X^{\dagger}X)^{kl}(q_l+ip^l)(q_k-ip^k) \end{array}\right]; \end{aligned} \qquad (4.24)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}^2_{non-BPS(,Z_{AB}=0)} &= Z_I\overline{Z}^I=\rho^2= \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left[\begin{array}{l} \left[(q_D+ip^D)X^D+(q_l-ip^l)\left(\sqrt{1+X^T\overline{X}}\right)^{\ l}\right]\cdot \\ \cdot\left[(X^{\dagger})^C(q_C-ip^C)+\left(\sqrt{1+X^T\overline{X}}\right)^{\ i}(q_i+ip^i)\right] \end{array}\right]= \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left[\begin{array}{l} (XX^{\dagger})^{CD}(q_C+ip^C)(q_D-ip^D)+ \\ +(\sqrt{1+X^{\dagger}X}\,X^{\dagger})^{l\,C}(q_l-ip^l)(q_C-ip^C)+ \\ +(X\sqrt{1+X^{\dagger}X})^{D\,i}(q_D+ip^D)(q_i+ip^i)+ \\ +(1+X^{\dagger}X)^{l\,i}(q_l-ip^l)(q_i+ip^i)\ . \end{array}\right], \end{aligned} \qquad (4.25)$$

where Eqs. (4.22) and (4.23) were used. Notice that, since all the contractions of $SU(3)$ and $SU(n)$ indices of electric and magnetic BH charges are uniquely defined with respect to the row or columns of the matrix X, every transposition index has been suppressed in Eqs. (4.24) and (4.25).

By introducing the *complexified graviphoton* and *matter* BH charges respectively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_C &\equiv q_C+ip^C; \qquad (4.26)\\ Q_i &\equiv q_i+ip^i, \qquad (4.27) \end{aligned}$$

Eqs. (4.24) and (4.25) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\mathcal{W}^2_{BPS} = \frac{1}{2}\left[\begin{array}{l} (1+XX^\dagger)^{AB}\overline{Q}_A Q_B + (\sqrt{1+XX^\dagger}\,X)^{\ Ai} Q_i Q_A + \\ +(X^\dagger\sqrt{1+XX^\dagger})^{j\,B}\overline{Q}_B\overline{Q}_j + (X^\dagger X)^{k\,l}\overline{Q}_k Q_l \end{array}\right]; \tag{4.28}$$

$$\mathcal{W}^2_{non-BPS} = \frac{1}{2}\left[\begin{array}{l} (XX^\dagger)^{AB} Q_A\overline{Q}_B + (\sqrt{1+X^\dagger X}\,X^\dagger)^{i\,A}\overline{Q}_i\overline{Q}_A + \\ +(X\sqrt{1+X^\dagger X})^{B\,j} Q_B Q_j + (1+X^\dagger X)^{k\,l}\overline{Q}_k Q_l \end{array}\right]. \tag{4.29}$$

4.1 Attractor Equations and their Solutions

The *BH effective potential* can be written as

$$V_{BH} = \frac{1}{2} Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB} + Z_I\overline{Z}^I = \mathcal{Z}_1^2 + \rho^2. \tag{4.30}$$

The $\mathcal{N}=3$, $d=4$ *Attractor Eqs.* are nothing but the *criticality conditions* for such an $H_{\mathcal{N}=3,n}$-invariant (and Kähler-gauge-invariant) quantity. Such criticality conditions are satisfied for two classes of critical points :

- ($\frac{1}{3}$-)BPS:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_I &= 0 \ \forall I = 1,...,n \Leftrightarrow \rho = 0; \\ Z_{AB} &\neq 0; \end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

- non-supersymmetric (non-BPS with $Z_{AB}=0$):

$$\begin{aligned} Z_I &\neq 0 \ (\textit{at least} \text{ for some } I); \\ Z_{AB} &= 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{Z}_1 = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

It is worth counting here the degrees of freedom related to Eqs. (4.31) and (4.32).

The $\frac{1}{3}$-BPS criticality conditions (4.31) are n *complex* independent ones, thus a moduli space of $\frac{1}{3}$-BPS attractors, spanned by the $2n$ *complex* scalars unstabilized by Eq. (4.31) might - and actually does [25] - exist.

Furthermore, there are only three *complex* non-BPS $Z=0$ criticality conditions (4.32). This fact paves the way to the possibility to have a *moduli space* of non-BPS ($Z_{AB}=0$) attractors, spanned by the $3(n-1)$ *complex* scalars unstabilized by Eq. (4.32); this actually holds true [41], as it will be explicitly found below (see Subsection 4.1.2).

4.1.1 $\frac{1}{3}$-BPS Attractors and their Moduli Space

By inserting the ($\frac{1}{3}$-)BPS criticality conditions (4.31) into the expression (4.23) of the *matter charges* Z_I and recalling the definitions (4.26) and (4.27) of the *complexified* BH charges, one obtains

$$(X^\dagger)_I^A\overline{Q}_A = -\left(\sqrt{1+X^T\overline{X}}\right)_I^{\ i} Q_i, \ \forall I = 1,...,n. \tag{4.33}$$

By plugging such an expression and its Hermitian conjugate into Eq. (4.28), and using the identity (holding for any matrix A)

$$A^\dagger\sqrt{1+AA^\dagger} = \sqrt{1+A^\dagger A}\ A^\dagger \tag{4.34}$$

and its Hermitian conjugate

$$\sqrt{1+AA^\dagger}\ A = A\sqrt{1+A^\dagger A}\ , \tag{4.35}$$

one obtains that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)_{BPS} &= (1+XX^{\dagger})^{AB}\overline{Q}_A Q_B + (X\sqrt{1+X^{\dagger}X}\,)^{Ai} Q_i Q_A + \\
&\quad +(\sqrt{1+X^{\dagger}X}X^{\dagger})^{j\,B}\overline{Q}_B\overline{Q}_j + (X^{\dagger}X)^{kl}\overline{Q}_k Q_l = \\
&= Q_A\overline{Q}_A + (XX^{\dagger})^{AB}\overline{Q}_A Q_B - (XX^{\dagger})^{AB} Q_A\overline{Q}_B + \\
&\quad -(1+X^{\dagger}X)^{ij}\overline{Q}_i Q_j + (X^{\dagger}X)^{ij}\overline{Q}_i Q_j = \\
&= Q_A\overline{Q}_A - Q_i\overline{Q}_i \ , \qquad (4.36)
\end{aligned}
$$

where in the last step we exploited the Hermiticity of $XX^{\dagger}$, yielding that ($\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{XX^{\dagger}}$ denotes the $XX^{\dagger}$-dependent square norm of *complexified* BH charges)

$$
(XX^{\dagger})^{AB} Q_A\overline{Q}_B \equiv \langle Q, Q\rangle_{XX^{\dagger}} = \langle\overline{Q},\overline{Q}\rangle_{XX^{\dagger}} = (XX^{\dagger})^{AB}\overline{Q}_A Q_B \ . \qquad (4.37)
$$

By recalling Eqs. (1.2) and (4.30), and using Eq. (4.36), one achieves the following result:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{S_{BH,BPS}}{\pi} &= \frac{A_{H,BPS}}{4} = V_{BH}|_{BPS} = \mathcal{Z}^2_{1,BPS} = \frac{1}{2}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)_{BPS} = \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(Q_A\overline{Q}_A - Q_i\overline{Q}_i\right) = \mathcal{I}_2 > 0. \qquad (4.38)
\end{aligned}
$$

Here $\mathcal{I}_2$ denotes the (unique) invariant of the *fundamental/anti-fundamental* $\left(\mathbf{3+n},\overline{\mathbf{3+n}}\right)$ representation of the U-duality group $G_{\mathcal{N}=3,n}$ (not *irreducible* with respect to $G_{\mathcal{N}=3,n}$ itself), *quadratic* in BH charges (see Eq. (5.1) below):

$$
\mathcal{I}_2 = \frac{1}{2}\left[q_A^2 - q_i^2 + \left(p^A\right)^2 - \left(p^i\right)^2\right] = \frac{1}{2}\left(q^2 + p^2\right), \qquad (4.39)
$$

where $q^2 \equiv \eta^{\Lambda\Sigma}q_\Lambda q_\Sigma$ and $p^2 \equiv \eta_{\Lambda\Sigma}p^\Lambda p^\Sigma$, $\eta^{\Lambda\Sigma} = \eta_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ being the $(3+n)$-dim. Lorentzian metric with signature $(3,n)$ (see the discussion in Sect. 5). In terms of the *dressed* charges Z_{AB} and Z_I, the (*only apparently* moduli-dependent) expression of $\mathcal{I}_2$ reads (see *e.g.* [91, 89, 90]):

$$
\mathcal{I}_2 = \frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB} - Z_I\overline{Z}^I = \mathcal{Z}_1^2 - \rho^2 \qquad (4.40)
$$

As mentioned above, the $\frac{1}{3}$-BPS criticality conditions (4.31) or (4.33) are a set of n *complex* equations, which thus does not stabilize *all* the $3n$ *complex* scalar fields z^i in terms of the BH electric and magnetic charges. In [56] the residual $2n$ unstabilized scalars have been shown to span the $\frac{1}{3}$-BPS moduli space

$$
\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=3,n,BPS} = \frac{SU(2,n)}{SU(2)\times SU(n)\times U(1)} \ , \ dim_{\mathbb{R}} = 4n. \qquad (4.41)
$$

4.1.2 Non-BPS ($Z_{AB} = 0$) Attractors and their Moduli Space

By inserting the non-BPS ($Z_{AB} = 0$) criticality conditions (4.32) into the expression (4.22) of the *central charge matrix* Z_{AB} and recalling the definitions (4.26) and (4.27) of the *complexified* BH charges, one obtains

$$
\left(\sqrt{1+XX^{\dagger}}\right)_{AB}^{\ \ C} Q_C = -(\overline{X})^i_{AB}\overline{Q}_i, \ \forall A,B = 1,2,3. \qquad (4.42)
$$

By plugging such an expression and its Hermitian conjugate into Eq. (4.29), and using the identities (4.34) and (4.35), one obtains that

$$\begin{aligned}
2\left(Z_I\overline{Z}^I\right)_{non-BPS} &= (XX^\dagger)^{AB}Q_A\overline{Q}_B + (X^\dagger\sqrt{1+XX^\dagger})^{i\,A}\overline{Q}_i\overline{Q}_A + \\
&\quad +(\sqrt{1+XX^\dagger}X)^{B\,j}Q_BQ_j + (1+X^\dagger X)^{kl}\overline{Q}_kQ_l = \\
&= (XX^\dagger)^{AB}Q_A\overline{Q}_B - (1+XX^\dagger)^{AB}Q_A\overline{Q}_B + \\
&\quad -(X^\dagger X)^{ij}\overline{Q}_iQ_j + (1+X^\dagger X)^{ij}\overline{Q}_iQ_j = \\
&= Q_i\overline{Q}_i - Q_A\overline{Q}_A\ . \qquad (4.43)
\end{aligned}$$

where once again Eq. (4.37) was used.

By recalling Eqs. (1.2) and (4.30), and using Eq. (4.43), one achieves the following result:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{S_{BH,non-BPS}}{\pi} &= \frac{A_{H,non-BPS}}{4} = V_{BH}|_{non-BPS} = \rho^2_{non-BPS} = \left(Z_I\overline{Z}^I\right)_{non-BPS} = \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}\left(Q_A\overline{Q}_A - Q_i\overline{Q}_i\right) = -\mathcal{I}_2 > 0, \qquad (4.44)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{I}_2$ is the *quadratic* $G_{\mathcal{N}=3,n}$-invariant, given by Eqs. (4.39) and (4.40).

As mentioned above, the non-BPS criticality conditions (4.32) or (4.42) are a set of 3 *complex* equations, which thus does not stabilize *all* the $3n$ *complex* scalar fields z^i in terms of the BH electric and magnetic charges. In [56] the residual $3\,(n-1)$ unstabilized scalars have been shown to span the non-BPS ($Z_{AB}=0$) moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=3,n,non-BPS} = \frac{SU(3,n-1)}{SU(3)\times SU(n-1)\times U(1)} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=3,n-1},\ dim_{\mathbb{R}} = 6\,(n-1)\,. \qquad (4.45)$$

Thus, as it holds in symmetric $\mathcal{N}=2$, $d=4$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to $n_V=n$ Abelian vector multiplets, also in the considered $\mathcal{N}=3$, $d=4$ supergravity the BH charges supporting *non-degenerate* critical points of V_{BH} are split in two branches: the ($\frac{1}{3}$-)BPS one, defined by $\mathcal{I}_2>0$, and the non-BPS ($Z_{AB}=0$) one, corresponding to $\mathcal{I}_2<0$.

4.2 Black Hole Parameters for $\frac{1}{3}$-BPS Flow

By using the *Maurer-Cartan Eqs.* of $\mathcal{N}=3$, $d=4$ supergravity (see *e.g.* [91, 89, 90]), one gets [40]

$$\partial_i\mathcal{Z}_1 = \partial_i\mathcal{W}_{BPS} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\frac{P_{IAB,i}\overline{Z}^I\overline{Z}^{AB}}{\sqrt{Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{CD}}} = \frac{1}{4\mathcal{Z}_1}P_{IAB,i}\overline{Z}^I\overline{Z}^{AB}, \qquad (4.46)$$

where $P_{IAB}\equiv P_{IAB,i}dz^i$ is the holomorphic Vielbein of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=3,n}$. Here, ∇ denotes the $U\,(1)$-Kähler and $H_{\mathcal{N}=3,n}$-covariant differential operator.

Thus, by using the explicit expressions of $\mathcal{W}^2_{BPS}$ given by Eq. (4.28), using the *Maurer-Cartan Eqs.* of $\mathcal{N}=3$, $d=4$ supergravity (see *e.g.* [91, 89, 90]), and exploiting the *first order (fake supergravity) formalism* discussed in Sect. 2, one respectively obtains the following expressions of the *(square) ADM mass*, *covariant scalar charges* and *(square) effective horizon radius* for the $\frac{1}{3}$-BPS attractor flow:

$$\begin{aligned}
r^2_{H,BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right) &= M^2_{ADM,BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right) = \mathcal{W}^2_{BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right) = \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\lim_{\tau\to 0^-}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right) = \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left[\begin{array}{l}
(1+X_\infty X_\infty^\dagger)^{AB}\overline{Q}_AQ_B + (\sqrt{1+X_\infty X_\infty^\dagger}\,X_\infty)^{\ Ai}Q_iQ_A + \\
+(X_\infty^\dagger\sqrt{1+X_\infty X_\infty^\dagger})^{j\,B}\overline{Q}_B\overline{Q}_j + (X_\infty^\dagger X_\infty)^{k\,l}\overline{Q}_kQ_l
\end{array}\right];
\end{aligned}$$

(4.47)

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_{i,BPS}\left(z_{\infty},\overline{z}_{\infty},p,q\right) &= 2\lim_{\tau\rightarrow0^{-}}\left(\partial_{i}\mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)=\\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[\frac{P_{IAB,i}\overline{Z}^{I}\overline{Z}^{AB}}{\sqrt{Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{CD}}}\right]_{\infty}=\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}_{1}}P_{IAB,i}\overline{Z}^{I}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right]_{\infty}=\\ &= \frac{1}{2M_{ADM,BPS}\left(z_{\infty},\overline{z}_{\infty},p,q\right)}\left(P_{IAB,i}\overline{Z}^{I}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)_{\infty};\end{aligned}\tag{4.48}$$

$$\begin{aligned}R_{H,BPS}^{2} &= \lim_{\tau\rightarrow0^{-}}\left[\begin{array}{l}\mathcal{W}_{BPS}^{2}\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)+\\ \\ -4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right)\right)\left(\partial_{i}\mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)\cdot\\ \\ \cdot\left(\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)\end{array}\right]=\\ \\ &= \mathcal{I}_{2}\left(p,q\right)=V_{BH,BPS}=\frac{S_{BH,BPS}\left(p,q\right)}{\pi},\end{aligned}\tag{4.49}$$

where

$$X_{\infty}\equiv\lim_{\tau\rightarrow0^{-}}X\left(\tau\right).\tag{4.50}$$

Throughout all the treatment, the subscript "∞" indicates the evaluation at the scalars at *radial infinity* z_{∞}^{i}.

Eq. (4.49) proves Eq. (2.13) for the $\frac{1}{3}$-BPS attractor flow of the considered $\mathcal{N}=3$, $d=4$ supergravity. Such a result was obtained by using Eq. (4.46) and computing that

$$\begin{aligned}4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(\partial_{i}\mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right)\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{W}_{BPS} &= 4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(\partial_{i}\mathcal{Z}_{1}\right)\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{Z}_{1}=\\ &= \frac{G^{i\overline{j}}P_{IAB,i}\overline{P}_{JEF,\overline{j}}\overline{Z}^{I}Z^{J}\overline{Z}^{AB}Z^{EF}}{2Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{CD}}=Z_{I}\overline{Z}^{I}=\rho^{2},\end{aligned}\tag{4.51}$$

where the relation

$$G^{i\overline{j}}P_{IAB,i}\overline{P}_{JEF,\overline{j}}=\delta_{IJ}\left(\delta_{AE}\delta_{BF}-\delta_{AF}\delta_{BE}\right)\tag{4.52}$$

was exploited.

The considerations made at the end of Subsect. 3.2 hold also for the considered attractor flow.

As pointed out above, the same also holds for ($\frac{1}{2}$-BPS attractor flow of) $\mathcal{N}=2$, $d=4$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to Abelian vector multiplets (see Eq. (150) of [63]), in which the (*unique*) invariant of the U-duality group $SU\left(1,n\right)$ is *quadratic* in BH electric and magnetic charges. Such a similarity is ultimately due to the fact that $SU\left(m,n\right)$ is endowed with a pseudo-Hermitian *quadratic* form built out of the *fundamental* $\mathbf{m}+\mathbf{n}$ and *antifundamental* $\overline{\mathbf{m}+\mathbf{n}}$ representations.

Furthermore, Eq. (4.47) yields that the $\frac{1}{3}$-BPS attractor flow of the $\mathcal{N}=3$, $d=4$ supergravity does *not* saturate the *marginal stability bound* (see [83] and [54]; see also the discussion at the end of Subsect. 3.3).

4.3 Black Hole Parameters for Non-BPS ($Z_{AB}=0$) Flow

By using the *Maurer-Cartan Eqs.* of $\mathcal{N}=3$, $d=4$ supergravity (see *e.g.* [91, 89, 90]), one gets [40]

$$\partial_{i}\rho=\partial_{i}\mathcal{W}_{non-BPS}=\frac{1}{4}\frac{P_{IAB,i}\overline{Z}^{I}\overline{Z}^{AB}}{\sqrt{Z_{J}\overline{Z}^{J}}}=\frac{P_{IAB,i}\overline{Z}^{I}\overline{Z}^{AB}}{4\rho}.\tag{4.53}$$

Thus, by using the explicit expressions of $\mathcal{W}_{non-BPS}^{2}$ given by Eq. (4.29), using the *Maurer-Cartan Eqs.* of $\mathcal{N}=3$, $d=4$ supergravity (see *e.g.* [91, 89, 90]), and exploiting the *first order (fake supergravity)* *formalism* discussed in Sect. 2, one respectively obtains the following expressions of the *(square) ADM mass*, *covariant scalar charges* and *(square) effective horizon radius* for the non-BPS attractor flow:

$$\begin{aligned}
r^2_{H,non-BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right) &= M^2_{ADM,non-BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right)=\mathcal{W}^2_{non-BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right)=\\
&= \lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}\left(Z_I\overline{Z}^I\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)=\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left[\begin{array}{l}
(X_\infty X_\infty^\dagger)^{AB}Q_A\overline{Q}_B+(\sqrt{1+X_\infty^\dagger X_\infty}\,X_\infty^\dagger)^{i\,A}\overline{Q}_i\overline{Q}_A+\\
\\
+(X_\infty\sqrt{1+X_\infty^\dagger X_\infty})^{B\,j}Q_BQ_j+(1+X_\infty^\dagger X_\infty)^{k\,l}\overline{Q}_kQ_l
\end{array}\right];
\end{aligned}\tag{4.54}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{i,non-BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right) &= 2\lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}\left(\partial_i\mathcal{W}_{non-BPS}\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)=\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{P_{IAB,i}\overline{Z}^I\overline{Z}^{AB}}{\sqrt{Z_J\overline{Z}^J}}\right]_\infty=\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{P_{IAB,i}\overline{Z}^I\overline{Z}^{AB}}{\rho}\right]_\infty=\\
&= \frac{1}{2M_{ADM,non-BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right)}\left(P_{IAB,i}\overline{Z}^I\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)_\infty;
\end{aligned}\tag{4.55}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
R^2_{H,non-BPS} &= \lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathcal{W}^2_{non-BPS}\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)+\\
\\
-4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right)\right)\left(\partial_i\mathcal{W}_{non-BPS}\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)\cdot\\
\\
\cdot\left(\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{W}_{non-BPS}\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)
\end{array}\right]=\\
&= -\mathcal{I}_2\left(p,q\right)=V_{BH,non-BPS}=\frac{S_{BH,non-BPS}\left(p,q\right)}{\pi}.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.56}$$

Eq. (4.49) proves Eq. (2.13) for the non-BPS ($Z_{AB}=0$) attractor flow of the considered $\mathcal{N}=3$, $d=4$ supergravity. Such a result was obtained by using Eq. (4.53) and computing that

$$\begin{aligned}
4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(\partial_i\mathcal{W}_{non-BPS}\right)\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{W}_{non-BPS} &= 4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(\partial_i\rho\right)\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\rho=\\
&= \frac{1}{4}\delta_{IK}\left(\delta_{AC}\delta_{BD}-\delta_{AD}\delta_{BC}\right)\frac{\overline{Z}^{AB}Z^{CD}\overline{Z}^IZ^K}{Z_J\overline{Z}^J}=\\
&= \frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}=\mathcal{Z}_1^2.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.57}$$

The considerations made at the end of Subsect. 3.2 hold also for the considered attractor flow.

It is worth noticing out that Eqs. (4.49) and (4.56) are consistent, because, as pointed out above, the ($\frac{1}{3}$-BPS)- and non-BPS ($Z_{AB}=0$)- supporting BH charge configurations in the considered theory are respectively defined by the *quadratic* constraints $\mathcal{I}_2\left(p,q\right)>0$ and $\mathcal{I}_2\left(p,q\right)<0$.

As yielded by Eqs. (4.48) and (4.55) for both *non-degenerate* attractor flows of the considered theory it holds the following relation among *scalar charges* and *ADM mass*:

$$\Sigma_i=\frac{1}{2M_{ADM}}\lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}P_{IAB,i}\overline{Z}^I\overline{Z}^{AB}.\tag{4.58}$$

Furthermore, Eq. (4.54) yields that the non-BPS $Z_{AB}=0$ attractor flow of the $\mathcal{N}=3$, $d=4$ supergravity does *not* saturate the *marginal stability bound* (see [83] and [54]; see also the discussion at the end of Subsect. 3.3).

5 Black Hole Entropy in *Minimally Coupled* $\mathcal{N} = 2$ and $\mathcal{N} = 3$ Supergravity

It is here worth remarking that the classical Bekenstein-Hawking [72] $d = 4$ BH entropy S_{BH} for *minimally coupled* $\mathcal{N} = 2$ and $\mathcal{N} = 3$ supergravity is given by the following $SU(m, n)$-invariant expression:

$$\frac{S_{BH}}{\pi} = \frac{1}{2}\left|q^2 + p^2\right|, \tag{5.1}$$

where $q^2 \equiv \eta^{\Lambda\Sigma} q_\Lambda q_\Sigma$ and $p^2 \equiv \eta_{\Lambda\Sigma} p^\Lambda p^\Sigma$, $\eta^{\Lambda\Sigma} = \eta_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ being the Lorentzian metric with signature (m, n). As said above, $\mathcal{N} = 2$ is obtained by putting $m = 1$, whereas $\mathcal{N} = 3$ is given by $m = 3$ (see Eqs. (3.21) and (4.39) above, respectively). Thus, in Eq. (5.1) the positive signature pertains to the *graviphoton charges*, while the negative signature corresponds to the charges given by the fluxes of the vector field strengths from the matter multiplets.

The supersymmetry-preserving features of the attractor solution depend on the sign of $q^2 + p^2$. The limit case $q^2 + p^2 = 0$ corresponds to the so-called *small* BHs (which however, in the case $\mathcal{N} = 3$, do *not* enjoy an enhancement of supersymmetry, contrarily to what usually happens in $\mathcal{N} \geqslant 4$, $d = 4$ supergravities; see *e.g.* the treatment in [71]).

By setting $n = 0$ in $\mathcal{N} = 3$, $d = 4$ supergravity (with resulting U-duality $U(3)$ which, due to the absence of scalars, coincides with the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ $\mathcal{R}$-symmetry $U(3)$ [92]), one gets

$$\frac{S_{BH}}{\pi} = \frac{1}{2}\left[q_1^2 + q_2^2 + q_3^2 + \left(p^1\right)^2 + \left(p^2\right)^2 + \left(p^3\right)^2\right], \tag{5.2}$$

which is nothing but the sum of the entropies of three *extremal* (and thus BPS; see *e.g.* the discussion in [63]) Reissner-Nördstrom BHs, *without any interference terms.* Such a result can be simply understood by recalling that the generalization of the Maxwell electric-magnetic duality $U(1)$ to the case of n Abelian gauge fields is $U(n)$ [88], and that the expression in the right-hand side of Eq. (5.2) is the unique possible $U(3)$-invariant combination of charges.

Moreover, it is here worth noticing that $\mathcal{N} = 3$, $d = 4$ supergravity is the only $\mathcal{N} > 2$ supergravity in which the gravity multiplet does *not* contain any scalar field at all, analogously to what happens in the case $\mathcal{N} = 2$. Thus, in *minimally coupled* $\mathcal{N} = 2$[6] and $\mathcal{N} = 3$, $d = 4$ supergravity the *pure* supergravity theory, obtained by setting $n = 0$, is *scalarless*, with the U-duality coinciding with the $\mathcal{R}$-symmetry [92].

This does *not* happen for all other $\mathcal{N} > 2$ theories. For instance, the $\mathcal{N} = 4$, $d = 4$ gravity multiplet does contain one complex scalar field (usually named *axion-dilaton*) and six Abelian vectors; thus, the *pure* $\mathcal{N} = 4$ theory, obtained by setting $n = 0$ (see Eqs. (A.1) and (7.1)), *is not scalarless.* By further truncating four vectors out (*i.e.* by performing a $(U(1))^6 \rightarrow (U(1))^2$ gauge truncation) and analyzing the bosonic field content, one gets the bosonic sector of $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $d = 4$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to one vector multiplet, the so-called *axion-dilaton supergravity* (for a discussion of the invariance properties of the classical BH entropy in such cases, see *e.g.* [63] and Refs. therein).

6 $\mathcal{N} = 5$ Supergravity

The (special Kähler) *scalar manifold* is [74]

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=5} = \frac{G_{\mathcal{N}=5}}{H_{\mathcal{N}=5}} = \frac{SU(1,5)}{SU(5) \times U(1)},\ dim_{\mathbb{R}} = 10. \tag{6.1}$$

As previously mentioned, *no* matter coupling is allowed (*pure* supergravity).

The 10 vector field strengths and their duals, as well as their asymptotical fluxes, sit in the *three-fold antisymmetric* irrepr. **20** of the U-duality group $G_{\mathcal{N}=5} = SU(1,5)$ (or equivalently of the compact form $SU(6)_{\mathbb{C}}$), and *not* in its *fundamental* repr. **6**.

$Z_{AB} = Z_{[AB]}$, $A, B = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 = \mathcal{N}$ is the *central charge matrix.* By means of a suitable transformation of the $\mathcal{R}$-symmetry $H_{\mathcal{N}=5} = U(5)$, Z_{AB} can be *skew-diagonalized* by putting it in the *normal*

---

[6] Let us notice also that $\mathcal{N} = 2$ *minimally coupled* theory is the only (symmetric) $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $d = 4$ supergravity which yields the *pure* $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity simply by setting $n = 0$.

form (see e.g. [40] and Refs. therein):

$$Z_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{Z}_1\epsilon & & \\ & \mathcal{Z}_2\epsilon & \\ & & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{6.2}$$

where $\mathcal{Z}_1, \mathcal{Z}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^+_0$ are the $\mathcal{N} = 5$ (moduli-dependent) *skew-eigenvalues*, which can be ordered as $\mathcal{Z}_1 \geqslant \mathcal{Z}_2$ without any loss of generality (up to renamings; see *e.g.* [40]), and can be expressed as follows (see also the treatment of [93]):

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{Z}_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sqrt{I_1 + \sqrt{2I_2 - I_1^2}}; \\ \\ \mathcal{Z}_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sqrt{I_1 - \sqrt{2I_2 - I_1^2}}; \end{array} \right. \Longleftrightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} I_1 = \mathcal{Z}_1^2 + \mathcal{Z}_2^2; \\ \\ I_2 = \mathcal{Z}_1^4 + \mathcal{Z}_2^4, \end{array} \right. \tag{6.3}$$

where

$$I_1 \equiv \frac{1}{2} Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}; \tag{6.4}$$

$$I_2 \equiv \frac{1}{2} Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC} Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA} \tag{6.5}$$

are the two *unique* (moduli-dependent) $H_{\mathcal{N}=5}$-invariants.

From the Lagrangian density of $\mathcal{N} = 5$, $d = 4$ supergravity [74], the vector kinetic terms read as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}^{vec}_{kin} = -\frac{1}{4}\sqrt{-g}(\mathcal{S}^{ij|kl} - \frac{1}{2}\delta^{ik}\delta^{jl})F^{+}_{\mu\nu|\,ij}F^{+\,\mu\nu}{}_{kl} + h.c. \; ; \tag{6.6}$$

here and below $i = 1, ..., 5$ and antisymmetrization of couple of i-indices is understood. In the Gaillard-Zumino formalism, it also holds (see Eq. (36) of [71])

$$\mathcal{L}^{vec}_{kin} = \sqrt{-g}\,\frac{i}{4}\mathcal{N}_{ij|kl}F^{+}_{\mu\nu|\,ij}F^{+\,\mu\nu}{}_{kl} + h.c. \; . \tag{6.7}$$

By comparing Eqs. (6.6) and (6.7), can write the 10×10 vector kinetic matrix $\mathcal{N}^{ij,kl}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{N}^{ij|kl} = i(\mathcal{S}^{ij|kl} - \frac{1}{2}\delta^{ik}\delta^{jl}) \; . \tag{6.8}$$

The matrix $\mathcal{S}$ satisfies the relation

$$(\delta^{ij}_{kl} - \overline{S}^{ij|kl})\mathcal{S}^{kl|mn} = \delta^{ij}_{mn} \; , \tag{6.9}$$

and, in a suitable choice of the scalar fields, it holds that

$$\overline{S}^{ij|kl} = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ijklm}z_m \; . \tag{6.10}$$

Thus, one finds (square brackets denote antisymmetrization of enclosed indices throughout)

$$\mathcal{S}^{ij|kl} = \frac{1}{1-(z_n)^2}\left[\delta^{ij}_{kl} - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ijklm}z_m - 2\delta_{[i\,[k}z_{l]}z_{j]}\right] \; , \tag{6.11}$$

where the last term is normalized as

$$\delta^{[i}_{[k}z^{j]}z_{l]} = \frac{1}{4}(\delta^{i}_{k}z^{j}z_{l} \pm permutations...). \tag{6.12}$$

Consequently, one achieves the following expression of the vector kinetic matrix:

$$\mathcal{N}_{ij|kl} = \frac{\alpha}{1-(z_m)^2}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left[1+(z_n)^2\right]\delta^{ij}_{kl} - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ijklp}z_p - 2\delta_{[i\,[k}z_{l]}z_{j]}\right) \; , \tag{6.13}$$

where α is a factor to be determined by the relations satisfied by the symplectic sections **h** and **f** defined in the last steps of Eqs. (4.16) and (4.17) above.

The supersymmetry transformation of the vector field can be written as [94]

$$\delta A_{\mu}^{ij} = 2f^{ij\,|AB}\bar{\psi}_{A\mu} + 2f_{AB}^{ij}\bar{\psi}_{\mu}^{A}\epsilon^{B} \ . \tag{6.14}$$

Such a formula is equivalent to the following expression [74] (see also [95]):

$$\delta A_{\mu}^{ij} = (\mathcal{S}^{ij|kl} - \delta^{ij|kl})(\mathcal{C}^{-1})_{kl}{}^{AB}(\bar{\epsilon}^{C}\gamma_{\mu}\chi_{ABC} + 2\sqrt{2}\bar{\epsilon}_{A}\psi_{B}) \ , \tag{6.15}$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}_{ij}{}^{kl} \equiv \frac{1}{e_1}\delta_{kl}^{ij} - 2\frac{e_2}{e_1}\delta_{[k}^{[i}z^{j]}z_{l]} \ ; \tag{6.16}$$

$$(\mathcal{C}^{-1})_{ij}{}^{kl} \equiv \left(e_1\delta_{ij}^{kl} + 2e_2\delta_{[k}^{[i}z^{j]}z_{l]}\right) \ , \tag{6.17}$$

and

$$e_1^2 \equiv \frac{1}{1-|z|^2} \ ; \tag{6.18}$$

$$e_2 \equiv \frac{1}{|z|^2}(1-e_1) \ . \tag{6.19}$$

By comparing Eqs. (6.14) and (6.15), one obtains that

$$f^{ij}{}_{AB} = \left(e_1\delta_{AB}^{ij} + \frac{e_1}{2}\epsilon^{ijABm}z_m + 2e_2\delta_{[i}^{[A}z^{B]}z_{j]}\right) \ . \tag{6.20}$$

The symplectic section **h** is

$$h_{ij|AB} = \mathcal{N}_{ij|mn}f_{AB}^{mn}, \tag{6.21}$$

and thus it explicitly reads

$$\begin{aligned} h_{ij|AB} &= \frac{\alpha}{1-(z_p)^2}\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \left[\frac{1}{2}\left(1-(z_q)^2\right)\delta_{kl}^{ij} - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ijklm}z_m - 2\delta_{[i[k}z_{l]}z_{j]}\right]\cdot \\ \cdot\left[e_1\delta_{AB}^{kl} + \frac{e_1}{2}\epsilon^{klABn}z_n + 2e_2\delta_{[k}^{[A}z^{B]}z_{l]}\right] \end{array} \right\} = \\ &= \alpha\left[\frac{e_1}{2}\delta_{AB}^{ij} - \frac{e_1}{4}\epsilon^{ijABk}z_k + e_2\delta_{[i}^{[A}z^{B]}z_{j]}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{6.22}$$

Next, we check the above results and determine the overall numerical factor α of the matrix $\mathcal{N}$, by expliciting writing down the identities (4.18) and (4.19) in the considered framework.

By recalling that

$$\frac{1}{4}\epsilon^{ijABk}\epsilon^{ijCDl}z_k z_l = (z_m)^2\,\delta_{CD}^{AB} - 2\delta_{[A[C}z_{D]}z_{B]}; \tag{6.23}$$

$$\delta_{[i}^{[A}z^{B]}z_{j]}\delta_{[i}^{[C}z^{D]}z_{j]} = \frac{1}{2}(z_m)^2\,\delta^{[A[C}z^{D]}z^{B]}, \tag{6.24}$$

the identity (4.19) is easily verified, because

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\mathbf{f}^T\mathbf{h}\right)^{AB}_{CD} &= \left(\mathbf{h}^T\mathbf{f}\right)^{AB}_{CD} = \\
&= \alpha\left\{\begin{array}{l} \left[\tfrac{e_1}{2}\delta^{ij}_{AB} - \tfrac{e_1}{4}\epsilon^{ijABk}z_k + e_2\delta^{[A}_{[i}z^{B]}z_{j]}\right]\cdot \\ \\ \cdot\left[e_1\delta^{ij}_{CD} + \tfrac{e_1}{2}\epsilon^{ijCDl}z_l + 2e_2\delta^{[C}_{[i}z^{D]}z_{j]}\right] \end{array}\right\} = \\
&= \alpha\left\{\begin{array}{l} \tfrac{e_1^2}{2}\delta^{AB}_{CD}\left(1-(z_i)^2\right) + e_1^2\delta_{[A[C}z_{D]}z_{B]} + e_2^2(z_i)^2\,\delta^{[A[C}z^{D]}z^{B]} + \\ \\ +2e_1e_2Re\left(\delta^{[C}_{[A}z^{D]}z_{B]}\right) \end{array}\right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.25}$$

In order to check the identity (4.18) and determine α, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{f}^\dagger\mathbf{h} &= f_{ij}{}^{AB}h_{ij|CD} = \\
&= \alpha\left\{\begin{array}{l} \left[e_1\delta^{AB}_{ij} + \tfrac{e_1}{2}\epsilon_{ijABk}z^k + 2e_2\delta^{[i}_{[A}z^{j]}z_{B]}\right]\cdot \\ \\ \cdot\left[\tfrac{e_1}{2}\delta^{ij}_{CD} - \tfrac{e_1}{4}\epsilon^{ijCDl}z_l + e_2\delta^{[C}_{[i}z^{D]}z_{j]}\right] \end{array}\right\} = \\
&= \alpha\left[\frac{1}{2}\delta^{AB}_{CD} + \frac{e_1^2}{4}\left(\epsilon_{ijABk}z^k - \epsilon^{ijABk}z_k\right) - \left(e_1^2 + e_1e_2 + e_2\right)\delta^{[C}_{[A}z^{D]}z_{B]}\right] = \\
&= \alpha\left[\frac{1}{2}\delta^{AB}_{CD} + i\frac{e_1^2}{2}Im\left(\epsilon_{ijABk}z^k\right)\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{6.26}$$

where we used the facts that $|z|^2\, e_2 = 1 - e_1$, and $e_1^2 + e_1e_2 + e_2 = 0$, directly following from the definitions (6.18) and (6.19).

By an analogous calculation, one achieves the following result:

$$\mathbf{h}^\dagger\mathbf{f} = \left(h_{ij|CD}\right)^\dagger f_{ij}{}^{AB} = \overline{\alpha}\left[\frac{1}{2}\delta^{AB}_{CD} + i\frac{e_1^2}{2}Im\left(\epsilon^{ijABk}z_k\right)\right]. \tag{6.27}$$

Consequently, the identity (4.18) is satisfied iff $\alpha = -i$. By substituting such a value into Eq. (6.13), one obtains the following expression of the vector kinetic matrix of $\mathcal{N} = 5$, $d = 4$ *ungauged* supergravity:

$$\mathcal{N}_{ij|kl} = -\frac{i}{1-(z_m)^2}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left[1+(z_n)^2\right]\delta^{ij}_{kl} - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ijklp}z_p - 2\delta_{[i\,[k}z_{l]}z_{j]}\right)\ . \tag{6.28}$$

From the general definition[7] (4.20), the *central charge matrix* Z_{AB} is defined as the integral over the 2-sphere at infinity S^2_∞ of the *dressed* graviphoton field strength [89, 90, 91]:

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{AB} &\equiv -\int_{S^2_\infty} T_{AB} = -\int_{S^2_\infty} T^-_{AB} = f^\Lambda_{AB}q_\Lambda - h_{\Lambda|AB}p^\Lambda = \\
&= f^{ij}_{AB}q_{ij} - h_{ij|AB}p^{ij}\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{6.29}$$

---

[7] We rescale the symplectic section **f** by a factor $\frac{1}{2}$, and the kinetic matrix $\mathcal{N}$ correspondingly by a factor 2. The definition of the symplectic section **h** through Eq. (6.21) and the identities (4.18) and (4.19) are left unchanged. Such a redefinition is performed in order to avoid an unsuitable rescaling of the magnetic charges, and thus to define the *complexified* BH charges as in Eq. (6.30).

By recalling Eqs. (6.20) and (6.22) with $\alpha = -i$, and, analogously to definitions (4.26) and (4.27), by introducing the *complexified* BH charges as

$$Q^{ij} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(q_{ij} + ip^{ij}\right), \tag{6.30}$$

one gets

$$Z_{AB}\left(z, \overline{z}, q, p\right) = e_1 Q^{AB} + \frac{e_1}{2}\epsilon^{ABijk}\overline{Q}^{ij} z_k - 2e_2 z^{[A} Q^{B]C} z_C. \tag{6.31}$$

As recalled at the start of the next Subsection, only ($\frac{1}{5}$-)BPS attractor flow is *non-degenerate* (*i.e.* corresponding to *large* BHs; see *e.g.* the discussion in [71]), and the corresponding (squared) *first order fake superpotential* is ([40]; recall Eqs. (6.3)-(6.5))

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}^2_{\left(\frac{1}{5}-\right)BPS} &= \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB} + \sqrt{Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC}Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA} - \frac{1}{4}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)^2}\right] = \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left[I_1 + \sqrt{2I_2 - I_1^2}\right] = \mathcal{Z}_1^2. \end{aligned} \tag{6.32}$$

6.1 Attractor Equations and their Solutions

Due to the absence of *matter charges*, the *BH effective potential* can be written as

$$V_{BH} = \frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB} = \mathcal{Z}_1^2 + \mathcal{Z}_2^2 = I_1. \tag{6.33}$$

The $\mathcal{N} = 5$, $d = 4$ *Attractor Eqs.* are nothing but the *criticality conditions* for the $H_{\mathcal{N}=5}$-invariant I_1. By using the *Maurer-Cartan Eqs.* of $\mathcal{N} = 5$, $d = 4$ supergravity (see *e.g.* [91, 89, 90]), such *Attractor Eqs.* can be written as follows:

$$\epsilon^{ABCDE}Z_{AB}Z_{CD} = 0; \tag{6.34}$$

$$\epsilon_{ABCDE}\overline{Z}^{AB}\overline{Z}^{CD} = 0, \tag{6.35}$$

where the two lines are reciprocally complex conjugated. They can also be written more explicitly, by using the expression of central charge matrix Z_{AB} given by Eq. (6.31). For instance, Eqs. (6.34) can be rewritten in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \epsilon^{ABCDE}Z_{AB}Z_{CD} = \\ &= e_1^2\epsilon^{ABCDE}Q^{AB}Q^{CD} + e_1^2(\epsilon^{ABCDi}\overline{Q}^{AB}\overline{Q}^{CD}z_i)z_E + 8e_1^2(Q^{AB}Q^{AB})z_E + \\ &\quad +16e_1^2 z_i Q^{iA}\overline{Q}^{AE} - 4e_1e_2\epsilon^{ABCDE}Q^{AB}z^C Q^{Di}z_i + \\ &\quad -8e_1e_2(z_iQ^{Di}\overline{Q}^{CD}z^C)z_E - 16e_1e_2|z|^2 z_j Q^{ij}\overline{Q}^{iE}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{6.36}$$

The criticality conditions (6.35) and (6.36) are satisfied for a unique class of critical points (for further elucidation, see *e.g.* the treatment in [71]):

- ($\frac{1}{5}$-)BPS:

$$\mathcal{Z}_2 = 0,\ \mathcal{Z}_1 > 0. \tag{6.37}$$

It is worth counting here the degrees of freedom related to Eqs. (6.34) and (6.35), or equivalently to the unique $\frac{1}{5}$-BPS solution given by Eq. (6.37). Eqs. (6.34) and (6.35) are 10 *real* equations, but actually only 6 *real* among them are independent. Thus a moduli space of $\frac{1}{5}$-BPS attractors, spanned by the 2 *complex* scalars unstabilized by Eq. (6.37), might - and actually does [56] - exist. Such a counting of "flat" directions of V_{BH} at its $\frac{1}{5}$-BPS critical points was given in terms of the left-over would-be $\mathcal{N} = 2$ hyperscalars' degrees of freedom in the $\mathcal{N} = 5 \rightarrow \mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry reduction in [91].

6.1.1 Entropy of $\frac{1}{5}$-BPS Attractors and their Moduli Space

By recalling Eqs. (1.1) and (6.33), and using Eq. (6.37), one achieves the following result:

$$\frac{S_{BH,BPS}}{\pi}=\frac{A_{H,BPS}}{4}=\left.V_{BH}\right|_{BPS}=\mathcal{Z}_{1,BPS}^{2}=\sqrt{\mathcal{I}_{4}}\ . \tag{6.38}$$

$\mathcal{I}_4$ here denotes the (unique) invariant of the *three-fold antisymmetric* **20** representation of the U-duality group $G_{\mathcal{N}=5}$. Such a representation is *symplectic*, containing the singlet $\mathbf{1}_a$ in the tensor product $\mathbf{20}\times\mathbf{20}$ [96], and it is thus *irreducible* with respect to both $G_{\mathcal{N}=5}$ and $Sp\left(20,\mathbb{R}\right)$). $\mathcal{I}_4$ is *quartic* in BH charges.

In terms of the *dressed* charges, *i.e.* of the central charge matrix Z_{AB}, $\mathcal{I}_4$ can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_{4} &= Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC}Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA}-\frac{1}{4}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)^{2}=2I_{2}-I_{1}^{2}=\\ &= Tr(A^{2})-\frac{1}{4}\left(Tr\ (A)\right)^{2}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.39}$$

where the (moduli-dependent) matrix $A_{A}{}^{B}\equiv Z_{AC}\overline{Z}^{BC}$ and the related quantities [71]

$$Tr\ (A) = Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}=2I_{1}=2V_{BH}; \tag{6.40}$$

$$Tr(A^{2}) = Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC}Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA}=2I_{2}, \tag{6.41}$$

were introduced, I_1 and I_2 being the two *unique* (moduli-dependent) $H_{\mathcal{N}=5}$-invariants, respectively defined by Eqs. (6.4) and (6.5).

The U-invariant $\mathcal{I}_4$, introduced in Eq. (6.38) and expressed in terms of *dressed* charges by Eq. (6.39), is the *unique* (moduli-independent) independent $G_{\mathcal{N}=5}$ =-invariant combination of (moduli-dependent) $H_{\mathcal{N}=5}$-invariant quantities (see *e.g.* [91], and [71], as well as Refs. therein). Its *quarticity* in BH charges is ultimately due to the *symplectic* nature of the **20** of $SU\left(1,5\right)$ (*irreducible* with respect to *both* $SU\left(1,5\right)$ and $Sp\left(20,\mathbb{R}\right)$), *i.e.* to the fact that the tensor product $\mathbf{20}\times\mathbf{20}$ contains an *antisymmetric* singlet $\mathbf{1}_a$ [96], thus yielding a vanishing *quadratic* invariant of $SU\left(1,5\right)$.

Thus, the expression (6.39) is moduli-dependent *only apparently.* Being moduli-independent, $\mathcal{I}_4$ can actually be written only in terms of the BH charges. In order to determine such an expression, one can use the fact that, in the considered coordinate parametrization, the origin O of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=5}$ (determined by $z^i=0\ \forall i=1,...,5$) is the invariant point under the action of $H_{\mathcal{N}=5}=U(5)$ (see *e.g.* Eq. (2.17) of [74]). Thus, the explicit dependence of $\mathcal{I}_4$ on BH charges is obtained simply by computing $\left.Z_{AB}\right|_{O}$ and using Eq. (6.39). By recalling Eq. (6.31) and Eqs. (6.40) and (6.41), one obtains:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_{4} &= Q_{AB}Q^{BC}Q_{CD}Q^{DA}-\frac{1}{4}(Q_{AB}\,Q^{AB})^{2}\ =\\ &= \frac{1}{2^{4}}\left(q_{AB}-ip^{AB}\right)\left(q_{BC}+ip^{BC}\right)\left(q_{CD}-ip^{CD}\right)\left(q_{DA}+ip^{DA}\right)+\\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2^{6}}\left[\left(q_{AB}-ip^{AB}\right)\ \left(q_{AB}+ip^{AB}\right)\right]^{2},\end{aligned} \tag{6.42}$$

where the *complexified* BH charges Q^{ij} defined by Eq. (6.30) have been used, with $Q_{AB}\equiv\overline{Q^{AB}}$. Eq. (6.42) is manifestly $H_{N=5}$-invariant, the $10+10$ *real* BH charges being arranged in the (reciprocally conjugated) *complex rank*-2 tensors Q^{ij} and Q_{ij} in the *two-fold antisymmetric* **10** and **10′** of $SU\left(5\right)$, or equivalently in the *real rank*-2 tensors q_{ij} and p^{ij} in a pair of *two-fold antisymmetric* **10** of $SO\left(5\right)$.

Clearly, the BH electric and magnetic BH charges, being the asymptotical fluxes of the vector field strengths and of their duals, can actually be arranged to sit in the *three-fold antisymmetric*, *symplectic* representation **20** of the U-duality group $G_{\mathcal{N}=5}=SU\left(1,5\right)$. The embedding of the *two-fold antisymmetric* $\mathbf{10}^{(\prime)}$ of $SU\left(5\right)$ into the *three-fold antisymmetric* **20** of $SU\left(1,5\right)$ is given by the formula $\left(a,b,c,d,e=1,...,5\right)$

$$t^{abc}\equiv\frac{1}{3!}\epsilon^{abcde6}t_{de}\ , \tag{6.43}$$

or, more precisely (recall $A, B, C = 1, ..., 5$, and moreover $\widehat{A}, \widehat{B}, \widehat{C} = 1, ..., 6$, here and below):

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\widehat{A}\widehat{B}\widehat{C}} &\equiv q_{\widehat{A}\widehat{B}\widehat{C}} + ip^{\widehat{A}\widehat{B}\widehat{C}} = (Q_{ABC}, Q_{AB6}) ; && (6.44)\\ Q_{ABC} &\equiv \frac{1}{3!}\epsilon_{ABCDE6}Q^{DE} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(q_{ABC} + ip^{ABC}\right) ; && (6.45)\\ Q_{6AB} &\equiv Q_{AB} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(q_{6AB} + ip^{6AB}\right) . && (6.46) \end{aligned}$$

Eq. (6.44) describes the splitting of the **20** of $SU(1,5)$ into the **10** and **10′** of $SU(5)$, whose embedding is determined by Eqs. (6.45) and (6.46), respectively. As given by Eq. (6.46), by identifying $t_{de} \equiv t_{de6}$, Eq. (6.43) can be seen as part of a self-reality condition (admitting solutions in $SU(1,5)$, but not in $SU(6)$).

Thus, it can be easily shown that Eq. (6.42) can be recast in a manifestly $U = G_{\mathcal{N}=5}$-invariant way, with BH charges in the *three-fold antisymmetric* **20** of $SU(1,5)$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_4 &= \frac{1}{3\cdot 2^5}\epsilon^{\widehat{A}\widehat{B}\widehat{C}\widehat{A}'\widehat{B}'\widehat{C}'''}\epsilon^{\widehat{A}''\widehat{B}''\widehat{C}''\widehat{A}'''\widehat{B}'''\widehat{C}'} Q_{\widehat{A}\widehat{B}\widehat{C}}Q_{\widehat{A}'\widehat{B}'\widehat{C}'}Q_{\widehat{A}''\widehat{B}''\widehat{C}''}Q_{\widehat{A}'''\widehat{B}'''\widehat{C}'''} = && (6.47)\\ &= \frac{1}{3\cdot 2^5}\epsilon^{\widehat{A}\widehat{B}\widehat{C}\widehat{A}'\widehat{B}'\widehat{C}'''}\epsilon^{\widehat{A}''\widehat{B}''\widehat{C}''\widehat{A}'''\widehat{B}'''\widehat{C}'} \left(q_{\widehat{A}\widehat{B}\widehat{C}} + ip^{\widehat{A}\widehat{B}\widehat{C}}\right)\left(q_{\widehat{A}'\widehat{B}'\widehat{C}'} + ip^{\widehat{A}'\widehat{B}'\widehat{C}'}\right)\cdot\\ &\quad\cdot\left(q_{\widehat{A}''\widehat{B}''\widehat{C}''} + ip^{\widehat{A}''\widehat{B}''\widehat{C}''}\right)\left(q_{\widehat{A}'''\widehat{B}'''\widehat{C}'''} + ip^{\widehat{A}'''\widehat{B}'''\widehat{C}'''}\right). && (6.48) \end{aligned}$$

In order to prove such a formula, let us explicit the entries "6" in Eq. (6.47), obtaining

$$\mathcal{I}_4 = \frac{1}{3\cdot 2^5}\left[\begin{array}{l} 9\,\epsilon^{6BCA'B'C'''}\epsilon^{6B''C''A'''B'''C'}Q_{6BC}Q_{A'B'C'}Q_{6B''C''}Q_{A'''B'''C'''}+\\ +12\,\epsilon^{ABC6B'C'''}\epsilon^{6B''C''A'''B'''C'}Q_{ABC}Q_{6B'C'}Q_{6B''C''}Q_{A'''B'''C'''}+\\ +6\,\epsilon^{ABCA'B'6}\epsilon^{6B''C''A'''B'''C'}Q_{ABC}Q_{6B'C'}Q_{A''B''C''}Q_{A'''B'''6}+\\ +4\,\epsilon^{ABC6B'C'''}\epsilon^{A''B''C''6B'''C'}Q_{ABC}Q_{6B'C'}Q_{A''B''C''}Q_{6B'''C'''}+\\ +\epsilon^{ABCA'B'6}\epsilon^{A''B''C''A'''B'''6}Q_{ABC}Q_{A'B'6}Q_{A''B''C''}Q_{A'''B'''6} \end{array}\right]. \qquad (6.49)$$

By using the embedding Eqs. (6.45) and (6.46), it is immediate to check that Eq. (6.49) yields Eq. (6.42).

As mentioned above, only 6 out of the 10 *real* $\frac{1}{5}$-BPS criticality conditions (6.34) and (6.35) are actually independent. Thus, they do not stabilize *all* the 5 *complex* scalar fields z^i in terms of the BH electric and magnetic charges, but only 3 of them. In [56] the residual 2 unstabilized *complex* scalar degrees of freedom have been shown to span the $\frac{1}{5}$-BPS moduli space

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=5,BPS} = \frac{SU(2,1)}{SU(2)\times SU(1)} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=3,n=1,BPS},\ dim_{\mathbb{R}} = 4. \qquad (6.50)$$

6.2 Black Hole Parameters for $\frac{1}{5}$-BPS Flow

By using the *Maurer-Cartan Eqs.* of $\mathcal{N} = 5$, $d = 4$ supergravity (see *e.g.* [91, 89, 90]), one gets [40]

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i\mathcal{Z}_1 &= \partial_i\mathcal{W}_{BPS} =\\ &= \frac{P_{,i}}{\sqrt{2}}\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB} - \sqrt{Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC}Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA} - \frac{1}{4}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)^2}} = P_{,i}\mathcal{Z}_2, \end{aligned} \qquad (6.51)$$

where $P \equiv P_{1234}$, $P_{ABCD} \equiv P_{ABCD,i}dz^i = \epsilon_{ABCDE}P^E$ being the holomorphic Vielbein of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=5}$. Here, ∇ denotes the $U(1)$-Kähler and $H_{\mathcal{N}=5}$-covariant differential operator.

Thus, by using the explicit expressions of $\mathcal{W}_{BPS}^2$ given by Eq. (6.32), using the *Maurer-Cartan Eqs.* of $\mathcal{N}=5$, $d=4$ supergravity (see *e.g.* [91, 89, 90]), and exploiting the *first order (fake supergravity) formalism* discussed in Sect. 2, one respectively obtains the following expressions of the *(square) ADM mass*, *covariant scalar charges* and *(square) effective horizon radius* for the $\frac{1}{5}$-BPS attractor flow:

$$\begin{aligned} r_{H,BPS}^2\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right) &= M_{ADM,BPS}^2\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right)=\mathcal{W}_{BPS}^2\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right)= \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\lim_{\tau\to 0^-}\left[\frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}+\sqrt{Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC}Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA}-\frac{1}{4}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)^2}\right]= \\ &= \left.\mathcal{Z}_1^2\right|_\infty ; \end{aligned} \tag{6.52}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{i,BPS}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right) &\equiv 2\lim_{\tau\to 0^-}\left(\partial_i\mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right)\left(z\left(\tau\right),\overline{z}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)= \\ &= \sqrt{2}\lim_{\tau\to 0^-}\left[P_{,i}\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}-\sqrt{Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC}Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA}-\frac{1}{4}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)^2}}\right]= \\ &= 2\left(P_{,i}\mathcal{Z}_2\right)_\infty ; \end{aligned} \tag{6.53}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & R_{H,BPS}^2=\mathcal{W}_{BPS}^2\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right)+ \\ & -4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty\right)\left(\partial_i\mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right)\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right)\left(\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right)\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right)= \\ & =\sqrt{Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC}Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA}-\tfrac{1}{4}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)^2}= \\ & =\sqrt{2\mathcal{Z}_1^4+2\mathcal{Z}_2^4-\left(\mathcal{Z}_1^2+\mathcal{Z}_2^2\right)^2}= \\ & =\mathcal{Z}_1^2-\mathcal{Z}_2^2=\sqrt{\mathcal{I}_4\left(p,q\right)}>0. \end{aligned} \tag{6.54}$$

Eq. (6.54) proves Eq. (2.13) for the $\frac{1}{5}$-BPS attractor flow of the considered $\mathcal{N}=5$, $d=4$ supergravity. Such a result was obtained by using Eq. (6.51) and computing that

$$\begin{aligned} & 4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(\partial_i\mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right)\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{W}_{BPS}=4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(\partial_i\mathcal{Z}_1\right)\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}}\mathcal{Z}_1= \\ & =2G^{i\overline{j}}P_{,i}\overline{P}_{,\overline{j}}\left[\tfrac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}-\sqrt{Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC}Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA}-\tfrac{1}{4}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)^2}\right]= \\ & =\tfrac{1}{2}\left[\tfrac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}-\sqrt{Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC}Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA}-\tfrac{1}{4}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)^2}\right]=\mathcal{Z}_2^2, \end{aligned} \tag{6.55}$$

where the relation

$$4G^{i\overline{j}}P_{,i}\overline{P}_{,\overline{j}}=1 \tag{6.56}$$

was used.

The considerations made at the end of Subsect. 3.2 hold also for the considered attractor flow.

It is worth noticing out that Eq. (6.54) is consistent, because, as pointed out above, the $\frac{1}{5}$-BPS-supporting BH charge configurations in the considered theory is defined by the *quartic* constraints $\mathcal{I}_4\left(p,q\right)>0$.

Furthermore, Eq. (6.52) yields that the $\frac{1}{5}$-BPS attractor flow of $\mathcal{N}=5$, $d=4$ supergravity does *not* saturate the *marginal stability bound* (see [83] and [54]; see also the discussion at the end of Subsect. 3.3).

7 $\mathcal{N}=4$ *Pure* Supergravity Revisited

The treatment of $\mathcal{N}=4$, $d=4$ *pure* supergravity is pretty similar to the one given for $\mathcal{N}=5$, $d=4$ supergravity in Sect. 6.

The (special Kähler) *scalar manifold* is [73]

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=4,pure}=\frac{G_{\mathcal{N}=4,pure}}{H_{\mathcal{N}=4,pure}}=\frac{SU(1,1)\times SU(4)}{U(1)\times SU(4)}=\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)},\ dim_{\mathbb{R}}=2, \tag{7.1}$$

spanned by the complex scalar

$$s\equiv a+ie^{-2\varphi},\ a,\varphi\in\mathbb{R}, \tag{7.2}$$

where a and φ are usually named *axion* and *dilaton*, respectively.

The 6 vector field strengths and their duals, as well as their asymptotical fluxes, sit in the *bi-fundamental* irrepr. $(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{6})$ of the U-duality group $G_{\mathcal{N}=4,pure}=SU(1,1)\times SO(6)\sim SU(1,1)\times SU(4)$.

$Z_{AB}=Z_{[AB]}$, $A,B=1,2,3,4=\mathcal{N}$ is the *central charge matrix.* By means of a suitable transformation of the $\mathcal{R}$-symmetry $H_{\mathcal{N}=4,pure}=U(1)\times SO(6)\sim U(1)\times SU(4)$, Z_{AB} can be *skew-diagonalized* by putting it in the *normal form* (see e.g. [40] and Refs. therein):

$$Z_{AB}=\begin{pmatrix}\mathcal{Z}_1\epsilon & \\ & \mathcal{Z}_2\epsilon\end{pmatrix}, \tag{7.3}$$

where $\mathcal{Z}_1,\mathcal{Z}_1\in\mathbb{R}_0^+$ are the $\mathcal{N}=4$ (moduli-dependent) *skew-eigenvalues*, which can be ordered as $\mathcal{Z}_1\geqslant\mathcal{Z}_2$ without any loss of generality (up to renamings; see *e.g.* [40]), and can be formally expressed by the very same Eqs. (6.3)-(6.5), where now I_1 and I_2 are the two *unique* (moduli-dependent) $H_{\mathcal{N}=4,pure}$-invariants.

The symplectic sections read as follows ($\Lambda\equiv[AB]=1,...,6$ throughout) [89, 90, 71]

$$f_{AB}^{\Lambda}=e^{\varphi}\delta_{AB}^{\Lambda},\quad h_{\Lambda|AB}=se^{\varphi}\delta_{\Lambda|AB}=\left(ae^{\varphi}+ie^{-\varphi}\right)\delta_{\Lambda|AB}, \tag{7.4}$$

such that the kinetic vector matrix is given by (recall Eq. (4.14))

$$\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}=\left(\mathbf{hf}^{-1}\right)_{\Lambda\Sigma}=s\delta_{\Lambda\Sigma}. \tag{7.5}$$

By the general definition (4.20), the c*entral charge matrix* is given by

$$Z_{AB}=f_{AB}^{\Lambda}q_{\Lambda}-h_{\Lambda|AB}p^{\Lambda}\ =e^{\varphi}\delta_{AB}^{\Lambda}q_{\Lambda}-se^{\varphi}\delta_{\Lambda|AB}p^{\Lambda}=-e^{\varphi}\left(sp_{AB}-q_{AB}\right). \tag{7.6}$$

Such an explicit expression allows one to elaborate Eqs. (6.3)-(6.5) further, obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}I_1 &\equiv \frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}=\mathcal{Z}_1^2+\mathcal{Z}_2^2=\frac{1}{2}e^{2\varphi}\left(sp_{AB}-q_{AB}\right)\left(\overline{s}p^{AB}-q^{AB}\right)=\\ &= e^{2\varphi}\left(sp_{\Lambda}-q_{\Lambda}\right)\left(\overline{s}p^{\Lambda}-q^{\Lambda}\right)=\\ &= \left(e^{2\varphi}a^2+e^{-2\varphi}\right)p^2+e^{2\varphi}q^2-2ae^{2\varphi}p\cdot q;\end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

$$\begin{aligned}I_2 &\equiv \frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC}Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA}=\mathcal{Z}_1^4+\mathcal{Z}_2^4=\\ &= \frac{1}{2}e^{4\varphi}\left(sp_{AB}-q_{AB}\right)\left(\overline{s}p^{BC}-q^{BC}\right)\left(sp_{CD}-q_{CD}\right)\left(\overline{s}p^{DA}-q^{DA}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

where $p^2\equiv\left(p^1\right)^2+...+\left(p^6\right)^2$, $q^2\equiv q_1^2+...+q_6^2$, and $p\cdot q\equiv p^{\Lambda}q_{\Lambda}$ (see Eq. (7.1) of [63], fixing a typo in Eq. (225) of [71]).

Only ($\frac{1}{4}$-)BPS attractor flow is *non-degenerate* (*i.e.* corresponding to *large* BHs; see *e.g.* the $n=0$ limit of the discussion in [71]), and the corresponding (squared) *first order fake superpotential* is identical to the one of the ($\frac{1}{5}$-)BPS attractor flow in $\mathcal{N}=5$, $d=4$ supergravity [40], given by Eq. (6.32) above, which in the considered framework can be further elaborated as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}^2_{\left(\frac{1}{4}-\right)BPS} &= \frac{1}{2}\left[I_1+\sqrt{2I_2-I_1^2}\right]=\mathcal{Z}_1^2= \\
&= \frac{e^{2\varphi}}{4}\left[\begin{array}{l}
\left(sp_{AB}-q_{AB}\right)\left(\overline{s}p^{AB}-q^{AB}\right)+ \\
+\sqrt{\begin{array}{l}
4\left(sp_{AB}-q_{AB}\right)\left(\overline{s}p^{BC}-q^{BC}\right)\left(sp_{CD}-q_{CD}\right)\left(\overline{s}p^{DA}-q^{DA}\right)+ \\
-\left[\left(sp_{AB}-q_{AB}\right)\left(\overline{s}p^{AB}-q^{AB}\right)\right]^2
\end{array}}
\end{array}\right].
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.9}
$$

7.1 Attractor Equations and their Solutions : $\frac{1}{4}$-BPS Attractors and their Entropy

Due to the absence of *matter charges*, the *BH effective potential* V_{BH} reads

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_{BH} &= \frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}=\mathcal{Z}_1^2+\mathcal{Z}_2^2=I_1= \\
&= \left(e^{2\varphi}a^2+e^{-2\varphi}\right)p^2+e^{2\varphi}q^2-2ae^{2\varphi}p\cdot q,
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.10}
$$

where in the second line we recalled Eq. (7.7) (see also the treatments of [71] and [63]). The *complex Attractor Eq.* of $\mathcal{N}=4$, $d=4$ *pure* supergravity is nothing but the *criticality condition* for the $H_{\mathcal{N}=4,pure}$-invariant I_1. By using the relevant *Maurer-Cartan Eqs.* (see *e.g.* [91, 89, 90]), such a *complex Attractor Eq.* can be written as follows ($|\varphi|<\infty$):

$$
\epsilon_{ABCD}\overline{Z}^{AB}\overline{Z}^{CD}\Leftrightarrow\epsilon_{ABCD}\left(\overline{s}p^{AB}-q^{AB}\right)^{\varphi}\left(\overline{s}p^{CD}-q^{CD}\right)=0.
\tag{7.11}
$$

An equivalent set of two *real* Eqs. is given by the system

$$
\frac{\partial V_{BH}}{\partial a}=0,\quad\frac{\partial V_{BH}}{\partial\varphi}=0,
\tag{7.12}
$$

with V_{BH} given by Eqs. (7.7) or (7.10), yielding Eqs. (7.2)-(7.3) of [63].

Thus, the criticality conditions (7.11), or equivalently (7.12), are satisfied for a unique class of critical points:

($\frac{1}{4}$-)BPS:

$$
\mathcal{Z}_2=0,\ \mathcal{Z}_1>0,
\tag{7.13}
$$

yielding Eqs. (7.2)-(7.3) of [63]. Eqs. (7.12) are 2 *real* Eqs. in 2 *real* unknowns, namely the *axion* a and the *dilaton* φ, which both are stabilized solely in terms of the magnetic and electric BH charges. Thus no moduli space of $\frac{1}{4}$-BPS attractors in $\mathcal{N}=4$, $d=4$ *pure* supergravity exists at all [71, 56, 63].

By recalling Eqs. (1.1) and (7.10), and using Eq. (7.13), one achieves the following result [97]:

$$
\frac{S_{BH,BPS}}{\pi}=\frac{A_{H,BPS}}{4}=\left.V_{BH}\right|_{BPS}=\mathcal{Z}^2_{1,BPS}=\sqrt{\mathcal{I}_4}\ .
\tag{7.14}
$$

$\mathcal{I}_4$ denotes the (unique) invariant of the *bi-fundamental* representation $(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{6})$ of the U-duality group $G_{\mathcal{N}=4,pure}$. Such a representation is *symplectic*[8], containing the singlet $\mathbf{1}_a$ in the tensor product $(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{6})\times(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{6})$ [96] (and thus yielding a vanishing *quadratic* U-invariant); consequently, it is *irreducible* with respect to both $G_{\mathcal{N}=4,pure}$ and $Sp\left(12,\mathbb{R}\right)$). $\mathcal{I}_4$ is *quartic* in BH charges (see Eq. (7.4), and the related discussion, of [63]) [97]:

$$
\mathcal{I}_4=4\left[p^2q^2-\left(p\cdot q\right)^2\right].
\tag{7.15}
$$

---

[8] This fact has been observed above also for $\mathcal{N}=5$, $d=4$ supergravity.

Even though in general the (unique) *quartic* invariant of a (semi-simple) Lie group can be built from a *non-symplectic* representation, this never happens for the U-duality groups of $\mathcal{N}=2$ symmetric and $\mathcal{N}>2$, $d=4$ theories. Thus, for all such supergravities having a (unique) U-invariant *quartic* in BH charges, the relevant representation of the U-duality group is *symplectic* (*irreducible* to both U-duality and relevant symplectic group).

In terms of the *dressed* charges, *i.e.* of the central charge matrix Z_{AB}, $\mathcal{I}_4$ is formally given by the very same Eqs. (6.39)-(6.41). $\mathcal{I}_4$ is the *unique* (moduli-independent) independent $G_{\mathcal{N}=4,pure}$-invariant combination of (moduli-dependent) $H_{\mathcal{N}=4,pure}$-invariant quantities (see *e.g.* the $n=0$ limit of the discussion in [91] and [71], and Refs. therein).

It is worth pointing out that only when $\Lambda=1,2$ (corresponding to the truncation $(U(1))^6\rightarrow(U(1))^2$ of the gauge group) $\mathcal{I}_4$ is a *perfect square*, thus reproducing the *quadratic* invariant $\mathcal{I}_2$ of the (1-modulus, $n=1$ element of the) *minimally coupled* $\mathcal{N}=2$, $d=4$ sequence, given by Eq. (3.21) (see *e.g.* [25] and [63], and Refs. therein).

7.2 Black Hole Parameters for $\frac{1}{4}$-BPS Flow

By using the *Maurer-Cartan Eqs.* of $\mathcal{N}=4$, $d=4$ *pure* supergravity (see *e.g.* [91, 89, 90]), one gets [40]

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_s\mathcal{Z}_1 &= \partial_s\mathcal{W}_{BPS}=\\ &= \frac{P_{,s}}{\sqrt{2}}\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}-\sqrt{Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC}Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA}-\frac{1}{4}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)^2}}=P_{,s}\mathcal{Z}_2,\end{aligned}\tag{7.16}$$

where $P\equiv P_{,s}ds$ is the holomorphic Vielbein of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=5}$. Here, ∇ denotes the $U(1)$-Kähler and $H_{\mathcal{N}=4,pure}$-covariant differential operator.

Thus, by using the explicit expressions of $\mathcal{W}^2_{BPS}$ given by Eq. (7.9), using the *Maurer-Cartan Eqs.* of $\mathcal{N}=5$, $d=4$ supergravity (see *e.g.* [91, 89, 90]), and exploiting the *first order (fake supergravity) formalism* discussed in Sect. 2, one respectively obtains the following expressions of the *(square) ADM mass*, *axion-dilaton charge* and *(square) effective horizon radius* for the $\frac{1}{4}$-BPS attractor flow:

$$\begin{aligned}r^2_{H,BPS}\left(s_\infty,\overline{s}_\infty,p,q\right) &= M^2_{ADM,BPS}\left(s_\infty,\overline{s}_\infty,p,q\right)=\mathcal{W}^2_{BPS}\left(s_\infty,\overline{s}_\infty,p,q\right)=\\ &= \frac{1}{2}\lim_{\tau\rightarrow0^-}\left[\frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}+\sqrt{Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC}Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA}-\frac{1}{4}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)^2}\right]=\\ &= \left.\mathcal{Z}^2_1\right|_\infty=\frac{i}{2\left(s_\infty-\overline{s}_\infty\right)}\cdot\\ &\quad\cdot\left[\begin{array}{l}\left(s_\infty p_{AB}-q_{AB}\right)\left(\overline{s}_\infty p^{AB}-q^{AB}\right)+\\ +\sqrt{\begin{array}{l}4\left(s_\infty p_{AB}-q_{AB}\right)\left(\overline{s}_\infty p^{BC}-q^{BC}\right)\cdot\\ \cdot\left(s_\infty p_{CD}-q_{CD}\right)\left(\overline{s}_\infty p^{DA}-q^{DA}\right)+\\ -\left[\left(s_\infty p_{AB}-q_{AB}\right)\left(\overline{s}_\infty p^{AB}-q^{AB}\right)\right]^2\end{array}}\end{array}\right];\end{aligned}\tag{7.17}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_{s,BPS}\left(s_\infty,\overline{s}_\infty,p,q\right) &\equiv 2\lim_{\tau\rightarrow0^-}\left(\partial_s\mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right)\left(s\left(\tau\right),\overline{s}\left(\tau\right),p,q\right)=\\ &= \sqrt{2}\left[P_{,s}\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}-\sqrt{Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC}Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA}-\frac{1}{4}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)^2}}\right]_\infty=\\ &= 2\left(P_{,s}\mathcal{Z}_2\right)_\infty;\end{aligned}\tag{7.18}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R^2_{H,BPS} = \mathcal{W}^2_{BPS}\left(z_\infty, \overline{z}_\infty, p, q\right) + \\
& -4G^{i\overline{j}}\left(z_\infty, \overline{z}_\infty\right)\left(\partial_i \mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right)\left(z_\infty, \overline{z}_\infty, p, q\right)\left(\overline{\partial}_{\overline{j}} \mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right)\left(z_\infty, \overline{z}_\infty, p, q\right) = \\
& = \sqrt{Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC} Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA} - \tfrac{1}{4}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)^2} = \\
& = \sqrt{2\mathcal{Z}_1^4 + 2\mathcal{Z}_2^4 - \left(\mathcal{Z}_1^2 + \mathcal{Z}_2^2\right)^2} = \mathcal{Z}_1^2 - \mathcal{Z}_2^2 = \\
& = \sqrt{Tr\left(A^2\right) - \tfrac{1}{4}\left(Tr\left(A\right)\right)^2} = \sqrt{\mathcal{I}_4\left(p, q\right)} > 0,
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.19}
$$

where, with suitable changes, the matrix ${A_A}^B$ and related quantities are defined by Eqs. (6.40) and (6.41).

Eq. (7.19) proves Eq. (2.13) for the $\frac{1}{4}$-BPS attractor flow of $\mathcal{N} = 4$, $d = 4$ *pure* supergravity. Such a result was obtained by using Eq. (7.16) and computing that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4G^{s\overline{s}}\left(\partial_s \mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right)\overline{\partial}_{\overline{s}}\mathcal{W}_{BPS} = 4G^{s\overline{s}}\left(\partial_s \mathcal{Z}_1\right)\overline{\partial}_{\overline{s}}\mathcal{Z}_1 = \\
& = 2G^{s\overline{s}} P_{,s}\overline{P}_{,\overline{s}}\left[\tfrac{1}{2} Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB} - \sqrt{Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC} Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA} - \tfrac{1}{4}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)^2}\right] = \\
& = \tfrac{1}{2}\left[\tfrac{1}{2} Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB} - \sqrt{Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC} Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA} - \tfrac{1}{4}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)^2}\right] = \mathcal{Z}_2^2,
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.20}
$$

where the relation

$$
4G^{s\overline{s}} P_{,s}\overline{P}_{,\overline{s}} = 1 \tag{7.21}
$$

was used.

From its very definition, by using Eqs. (7.9) or (7.17), the *axion-dilaton charge* $\Sigma_{s,BPS}$ can be explicitly computed as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{s,BPS} \;=\; & \frac{1}{M_{ADM,BPS}}\left(\partial_s \mathcal{W}^2_{BPS}\right)_\infty = \frac{1}{M_{ADM,BPS}}\cdot \\
& \cdot\left\{
\begin{array}{l}
-\frac{1}{s_\infty - \overline{s}_\infty} M^2_{ADM,BPS} + + \frac{i}{2\left(s_\infty - \overline{s}_\infty\right)}\cdot \\
\cdot\left[
\begin{array}{l}
p_{AB}\left(\overline{s}_\infty p^{AB} - q^{AB}\right) + \\
+\frac{1}{2}\left[
\begin{array}{l}
4\left(s_\infty p_{AB} - q_{AB}\right)\left(\overline{s}_\infty p^{BC} - q^{BC}\right)\cdot \\
\cdot\left(s_\infty p_{CD} - q_{CD}\right)\left(\overline{s}_\infty p^{DA} - q^{DA}\right) + \\
-\left[\left(s_\infty p_{AB} - q_{AB}\right)\left(\overline{s}_\infty p^{AB} - q^{AB}\right)\right]^2
\end{array}
\right]^{-1/2} \cdot \\
\cdot\left[
\begin{array}{l}
4p_{AB}\left(\overline{s}_\infty p^{BC} - q^{BC}\right)\left(s_\infty p_{CD} - q_{CD}\right)\left(\overline{s}_\infty p^{DA} - q^{DA}\right) + \\
+4\left(s_\infty p_{AB} - q_{AB}\right)\left(\overline{s}_\infty p^{BC} - q^{BC}\right) p_{CD}\left(\overline{s}_\infty p^{DA} - q^{DA}\right) + \\
-2\left(s_\infty p_{AB} - q_{AB}\right)\left(\overline{s}_\infty p^{AB} - q^{AB}\right) p_{CD}\left(\overline{s}_\infty p^{CD} - q^{CD}\right)
\end{array}
\right]
\end{array}
\right]
\end{array}
\right\}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.22}
$$

Furthermore, from the definition (7.2) and Eq. (7.18), it follows that

$$
\Sigma_{s,BPS} \equiv 2\lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}\left(\partial_s \mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right) = \Sigma_{a,BPS} + \frac{i}{2}e^{2\varphi_\infty}\Sigma_{\varphi,BPS}, \tag{7.23}
$$

where

$$\Sigma_{a,BPS} \equiv 2\lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}\left(\partial_a \mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right) = Re\left(\Sigma_{s,BPS}\right); \tag{7.24}$$

$$\Sigma_{\varphi,BPS} \equiv 2\lim_{\tau\rightarrow 0^-}\left(\partial_\varphi \mathcal{W}_{BPS}\right) = 2e^{-2\varphi_\infty} Im\left(\Sigma_{s,BPS}\right) = -i\left(s_\infty - \overline{s}_\infty\right) Im\left(\Sigma_{s,BPS}\right) \tag{7.25}$$

respectively are the *axionic* and *dilatonic charges* pertaining to the $\frac{1}{4}$-BPS attractor flow.

The considerations made at the end of Subsect. 3.2 hold also for the considered attractor flow.

It is worth noticing out that Eq. (7.19) is consistent, because, as pointed out above, the $\frac{1}{4}$-BPS-supporting BH charge configurations in the considered theory is defined by the *quartic* constraints $\mathcal{I}_4(p,q) > 0$.

Furthermore, Eq. (7.17) yields that the $\frac{1}{4}$-BPS attractor flow of $\mathcal{N}=4$, $d=4$ *pure* supergravity does *not* saturate the *marginal stability bound* (see [83] and [54]; see also the discussion at the end of Subsect. 3.3).

8 Peculiarity of *Pure* $\mathcal{N}=4$ and $\mathcal{N}=5$ Supergravity

By exploiting the *first order (fake supergravity) formalism* discussed in Sect. 2, the expression of the *squared effective horizon radius (in the extremal case* $c=0$*)* R_H^2 given by Eq. (2.12) has been shown to hold for the following $d=4$ supergravity theories:

- *minimally coupled* $\mathcal{N}=2$ theory, whose scalar manifold is given by the sequence $\frac{SU(1,n)}{SU(n)\times U(1)}$ ([75], also named *multi-dilaton system* in [63]; see Subsects. 3.2 and 3.3);
- $\mathcal{N}=3$ ([76], see Subsects. 4.2 and 4.3);
- $\mathcal{N}=5$ ([74], see Subsect. 6.2);
- $\mathcal{N}=4$ *pure* ([73], see Subsect. 7.2).

Such theories differ by a *crucial* fact: whereas the U-invariant of *minimally coupled* $\mathcal{N}=2$ and $\mathcal{N}=3$ supergravity is *quadratic*, the U-invariant of $\mathcal{N}=5$ and *pure* $\mathcal{N}=4$ theories is *quartic* in BH charges.

Thus, among all $d=4$ supergravities with U-invariant *quartic* in BH charges, the cases $\mathcal{N}=5$ and *pure* $\mathcal{N}=4$ turn out to be peculiar ones.

Such a peculiarity can be traced back to the form of their *Attractor Eqs.*, which are *structurally identical* to the ones of the *minimally coupled* $\mathcal{N}=2$ and $\mathcal{N}=3$ cases (see *e.g.* the treatments in [71] and [40]), and actually also to the very structure of $\mathcal{W}_{BPS}^2$, as given by Eqs. (6.32) and (7.9), respectively.

This is ultimately due to a remarkable property, expressed by the last two lines of Eqs. (6.54) and (7.19): the (*unique*) invariant $\mathcal{I}_4(p,q)$ of $G_{\mathcal{N}=5}$ and $G_{\mathcal{N}=4,pure}$, which is *quartic* in the electric and magnetic BH charges (p,q), is a *perfect square* of a quadratic expression when written in terms of the *moduli-dependent skew-eigenvalues* $\mathcal{Z}_1$ and $\mathcal{Z}_2$:

$$\mathcal{I}_4(p,q) \equiv Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{BC}Z_{CD}\overline{Z}^{DA} - \frac{1}{4}\left(Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB}\right)^2 = Tr\left(A^2\right) - \frac{1}{4}\left(Tr\left(A\right)\right)^2 = \left(\mathcal{Z}_1^2 - \mathcal{Z}_2^2\right)^2. \tag{8.1}$$

Such a result, which is true in the *whole* scalar manifolds $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=5}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=4,pure}$, does *not* generally hold for all other $\mathcal{N}>2$, $d=4$ supergravities with (unique) *quartic* U-invariant, *i.e.* for $\mathcal{N}=4$ *matter-coupled* and $\mathcal{N}=6,8$ theories, as well as for $\mathcal{N}=2$ supergravity whose scalar manifold does *not* belong to the aforementioned sequence of complex Grassmannians $\frac{SU(1,n)}{SU(n)\times U(1)}$.

This allows one to state that the relation (in the *extremal case* $c=0$) between the *square effective horizon radius* R_H^2 and the *square BH event horizon radius* r_H^2 for the *non-degenerate* attractor flows of such supergravities, *if any*, is *structurally different* from the one given by Eq. (2.12). Of course, in such theories one can still construct the quantity $r_H^2\left(z_\infty,\overline{z}_\infty,p,q\right) - G_{i\overline{j}}\Sigma^i\overline{\Sigma}^{\overline{j}}$ (eventually within a real parametrization of the scalar fields), but, also in the *extremal* case, it will be *moduli-dependent*, thus *not* determining $R_H^2(p,q)$.

Orbit	$\mathcal{N}=2$ *minimally coupled*, $n_V=3$	$\mathcal{N}=3,\ m=1$
$\frac{SU(1,3)}{SU(3)}$	$\mathcal{O}_{\frac{1}{2}-BPS}$, *no mod. space*, $\mathcal{I}_{2,\mathcal{N}=2}>0$	$\mathcal{O}_{non-BPS,Z_{AB}=0}$, *no mod. space*, $\mathcal{I}_{2,\mathcal{N}=3}<0$
$\frac{SU(1,3)}{SU(1,2)}$	$\mathcal{O}_{non-BPS,Z=0}$, *mod. space* $=\frac{SU(1,2)}{SU(2)\times U(1)}$, $\mathcal{I}_{2,\mathcal{N}=2}<0$	$\mathcal{O}_{\frac{1}{3}-BPS}$, *mod. space* $=\frac{SU(1,2)}{SU(2)\times U(1)}$, $\mathcal{I}_{2,\mathcal{N}=3}>0$

Table 1: **$\mathcal{N}$-dependent BPS-interpretations of the classes of *non-degenerate* orbits of the symmetric special Kähler manifold $\frac{SU(1,3)}{SU(3)\times U(1)}$**

9 $\mathcal{N}\geqslant 2$ Supergravities with the same Bosonic Sector and *"Dualities"*

In the present Section we consider $\mathcal{N}\geqslant 2$, $d=4$ supergravities[9] sharing the same bosonic sector, and thus with the same number of fermion fields, but with *different supersymmetric completions*.

I)

- $\mathcal{N}=2$ (*matter-coupled*) *magic* supergravity based on the degree 3 complex Jordan algebra $J_3^{\mathbb{H}}$;
- $\mathcal{N}=6$ supergravity.

The scalar manifold of both such theories (upliftable to $d=5$) is $\frac{SO^*(12)}{SU(6)\times U(1)}$ (*rank*-3 homogeneous symmetric special Kähler space). In both theories the 16 vector field strengths and their duals, as well as their asymptotical fluxes, sit in the left-handed spinor repr. $\mathbf{32}$ of the U-duality group $SO^*(12)$, which is *symplectic*, containing the symmetric singlet $\mathbf{1}_a$ in the tensor product $\mathbf{32}\times\mathbf{32}$, and thus irreducible with respect to both $SO^*(12)$ and $Sp(32,\mathbb{R})$. For a discussion of the spin/field content, see *e.g.* [89, 90].

The correspondences among the various classes of *non-degenerate* extremal BH attractors of such two theories have been studied in [25] (see *e.g.* Table 9 therein).

II)

- $\mathcal{N}=2$ supergravity *minimally coupled* to $n=n_V=3$ Abelian vector multiplets;
- $\mathcal{N}=3$ supergravity coupled to $m=1$ matter (Abelian vector) multiplet.

All such theories (*matter-coupled*, with *quadratic* U-invariant, and not upliftable to $d=5$) share the same scalar manifold, namely the *rank*-1 symmetric special Kähler space $\frac{SU(1,3)}{SU(3)\times U(1)}$. Furthermore, in both such theories the 4 vector field strengths and their duals, as well as their asymptotical fluxes, sit in the *fundamental* $\mathbf{4}$ repr. of the U-duality group $SU(3,1)$ (*not* irreducible with respect to $SU(3,1)$ itself, but only with respect to $Sp(8,\mathbb{R})$).

By (local) supersymmetry, the number of fermion fields is the same in the three theories, namely there are 8 bosons and 8 fermions, but with *different* relevant spin/field contents:

$$\begin{array}{ll}\mathcal{N}=2\ \textit{minimally coupled},\ n_V=3: & \left[1(2),2\left(\tfrac{3}{2}\right),1(1)\right],3\left[1(1),2\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\right),1_{\mathcal{C}}(0)\right];\\ \mathcal{N}=3,\ m=1: & \left[1(2),3\left(\tfrac{3}{2}\right),3(1),1\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\right)\right],1\left[1(1),4\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\right),3_{\mathcal{C}}(0)\right].\end{array}\tag{9.1}$$

From this it follows that one can switch between such two theories by transforming 1 *gravitino* in 1 *gaugino*, and *vice versa*.

---

[9] The relation between $\mathcal{N}=1$ and $\mathcal{N}=2$, $d=4$ supergravities and their attractor solutions is discussed in [36].

Orbit	$\mathcal{N}=2,\ n_V=7$	$\mathcal{N}=4,\ n=2$
$\frac{SU(1,1)\times SO(2,6)}{SO(2)\times SO(6)}$	$\mathcal{O}_{\frac{1}{2}-BPS}$, *no mod. space*, $\mathcal{I}_{4,\mathcal{N}=2}>0$	$\mathcal{O}_{non-BPS,Z_{AB}=0}$, *no mod. space*, $\mathcal{I}_{4,\mathcal{N}=4}>0$
$\frac{SU(1,1)\times SO(2,6)}{SO(2)\times SO(2,4)}$	$\mathcal{O}_{non-BPS,Z=0}$, *mod. space* $=\frac{SO(2,4)}{SO(2)\times SO(4)}$ $\mathcal{I}_{4,\mathcal{N}=2}>0$	$\mathcal{O}_{\frac{1}{4}-BPS}$, *mod. space* $=\frac{SO(2,4)}{SO(2)\times SO(4)}$ $\mathcal{I}_{4,\mathcal{N}=4}>0$
$\frac{SU(1,1)\times SO(2,6)}{SO(1,1)\times SO(1,5)}$	$\mathcal{O}_{non-BPS,Z\neq 0}$, *mod. space* $=SO(1,1)\times\frac{SO(1,5)}{SO(5)}$ $\mathcal{I}_{4,\mathcal{N}=2}<0$	$\mathcal{O}_{non-BPS,Z_{AB}\neq 0}$, *mod. space* $=SO(1,1)\times\frac{SO(1,5)}{SO(5)}$ $\mathcal{I}_{4,\mathcal{N}=4}<0$

Table 2: **$\mathcal{N}$-dependent BPS-interpretations of the classes of *non-degenerate* orbits of the reducible symmetric special Kähler manifold $\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}\times\frac{SO(2,6)}{SO(2)\times SO(6)}$.** The structure of the *"duality"* is analogous to the one pertaining to the manifold $\frac{SO^*(12)}{SU(6)\times U(1)}$ (see point **I** above, as well as Table 9 of [25])

The relation among the various classes of *non-degenerate* extremal BH attractors of such three theories [71, 56] is given in Table 1.

When switching between $\mathcal{N}=2$ and $\mathcal{N}=3$, the flip in sign of the *quadratic* U-invariant $\mathcal{I}_2=q^2+p^2$ can be understood by recalling that $q^2\equiv\eta^{\Lambda\Sigma}q_\Lambda q_\Sigma$ and $p^2\equiv\eta_{\Lambda\Sigma}p^\Lambda p^\Sigma$, with $\eta^{\Lambda\Sigma}=\eta_{\Lambda\Sigma}=diag\,(1,-1,-1,-1)$ in the case $\mathcal{N}=2$, and $\eta^{\Lambda\Sigma}=\eta_{\Lambda\Sigma}=diag\,(1,1,1,-1)$ in the case $\mathcal{N}=3$ (recall Eq. (5.1)). It is here worth pointing out once again that the positive signature pertains to the *graviphoton charges*, while the negative signature corresponds to the charges given by the asymptotical fluxes of the vector field strengths from the matter multiplets (see also the discussion in Sect. 5). As yielded by Table 1, the supersymmetry-preserving features of the attractor solutions depend on the sign of $\mathcal{I}_2$.

III)

- $\mathcal{N}=2$ supergravity coupled to $n_V=n+1=7$ Abelian vector multiplets, with scalar manifold $\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}\times\frac{SO(2,6)}{SO(2)\times SO(6)}$ (shortly named *"cubic"*, $n_V=7$ in Eq. (9.2));
- $\mathcal{N}=4$ supergravity coupled to $n_m=2$ matter (Abelian vector) multiplets.

The scalar manifold of both such theories (upliftable to $d=5$) is $\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}\times\frac{SO(2,6)}{SO(2)\times SO(6)}$ (homogeneous symmetric reducible special Kähler, with *rank* 3). In both theories the 8 vector field strengths and their duals, as well as their asymptotical fluxes, sit in the (spinor/doublet)-vector (*bi-fundamental*) repr. $(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{8})$ of the U-duality group $SU(1,1)\times SO(2,6)$, which is *symplectic*, containing the antisymmetric singlet $\mathbf{1}_a$ in the tensor product $(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{8})\times(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{8})$, and thus irreducible with respect to both $SU(1,1)\times SO(2,6)$ and $Sp(16,\mathbb{R})$.

Notice that, due to the isomorphism $\mathfrak{so}(6,2)\sim\mathfrak{so}^*(8)$ (see *e.g.* [86]), the *"dual"* supersymmetric interpretation of the scalar manifold $\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}\times\frac{SO(2,6)}{SO(2)\times SO(6)}$ can be considered, disregarding the *axion-dilaton* sector $\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}$, as a *"subduality"* of the *"duality"* discussed in point **I**.

By (local) supersymmetry, the number of fermion fields is the same in the three theories, namely there are 16 bosons and 16 fermions, but with *different* relevant spin/field contents:

$$\begin{array}{ll}\mathcal{N}=2\text{ ``cubic''},\ n_V=7: & \left[1(2),2\left(\tfrac{3}{2}\right),1(1)\right],7\left[1(1),2\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\right),1_{\mathcal{C}}(0)\right];\\ \mathcal{N}=4,n_m=2: & \left[1(2),4\left(\tfrac{3}{2}\right),6(1),4\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\right),1_{\mathcal{C}}(0)\right],2\left[1(1),4\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\right),3_{\mathcal{C}}(0)\right].\end{array}\tag{9.2}$$

From this it follows that one can switch between such two theories by transforming 2 *gravitinos* in 2 *gauginos*, and *vice versa*.

The correspondences among the various classes of *non-degenerate* extremal BH attractors of such two theories have been studied in [25, 41, 71, 56], and it is given in Table 2.

As yielded by the comparison of Table 9 of [25] and Table 2, such a *"duality"* is pretty similar to the *"duality"* between $\mathcal{N}=2$ $J_3^{\mathbb{H}}$ and $\mathcal{N}=6$ considered at point **I**, also because the sign of the *quartic* U-invariant is unchanged by the *"duality"* relation (this is also consistent with the *"subduality"* relation mentioned above). In this sense, it differs from the *"duality"* between $\mathcal{N}=2$ *minimally coupled*, $n_V=3$ and $\mathcal{N}=3$, $m=1$ considered at point **II**, because in both such theories the U-invariant is *quadratic*, and its sign is flipped by the *"duality"* relation (see Table 1).

Points **I-III** present evidences against the conventional wisdom that *interacting* bosonic field theories have a unique supersymmetric extension. The sharing of the same bosonic backgrounds with different supersymmetric completions implies the *"dual"* interpretation with respect to the supersymmetry-preserving properties of *non-degenerate* extremal BH attractor solutions (see respectively Table 9 of [25], Table 1 and Table 2).

10 Conclusion

In the present investigation we have considered the class of $\mathcal{N}\geqslant 2$, $d=4$ *ungauged* supergravity theories which do not have a counterpart in $d=5$ space-time dimensions. For such theories, the extremal BH parameters, namely, the *ADM mass* M_{ADM}, the *scalar charges* Σ^a and the *effective horizon radius* R_H, pertaining to *non-degenerate* attractor flows have a simple formulation in the *first order (fake supergravity) formalism*.

All such theories share the property that an *effective radial variable* R can be defined, such that the *effective BH (horizon) area* A is simply given by the surface of a sphere of radius $R_H(p,q)$, where $R_H(p,q)$ is the *moduli-independent effective horizon radius* of the extremal BH.

For $\mathcal{N}=2$ this holds for supergravity *minimally coupled* to Abelian vector multiplets, but it does *not* hold for more general matter couplings, such as symmetric spaces coming from degree three Jordan Algebras [81] with cubic holomorphic prepotential. In this respect, *minimally coupled* $\mathcal{N}=2$ supergravity can be considered as a *multi-dilaton system* in that it generalizes the *Maxwell-Einstein-axion-dilaton system*, studied in Refs. [77] and [78] (see also the recent treatment in [63]). *Matter-coupled* supergravity with $\mathcal{N}=3$ shares similar properties. Both such theories exhibit two class of *non-degenerate* attractors (BPS and non-BPS), and a Bekenstein-Hawking classical BH entropy *quadratic* in the electric and magnetic BH charges. Furthermore, non-BPS ($Z=0$) $\mathcal{N}=2$ attractors and $\mathcal{N}=3$ (both ($\frac{1}{3}$-)BPS and non-BPS ($Z_{AB}=0$)) attractors yield a related moduli space of solutions.

Pure $\mathcal{N}=4$ and $\mathcal{N}=5$ supergravities have also the same formula yielding to define $R_H(p,q)$, in spite of the fact that the classical BH entropy is not *quadratic*, but rather the square root of a *quartic* expression, in terms of the BH charges. Such theories have only BPS attractors, and for $\mathcal{N}=5$ a residual moduli space of solutions also exists.

It would be interesting to extend the notion of *effective radius* and of *fake supergravity formalism* to other $d=4$ theories, such as $\mathcal{N}=2$ *not minimally coupled to* Abelian vector multiplets, *matter-coupled* $\mathcal{N}=4$, $\mathcal{N}=6$ and $\mathcal{N}=8$. In these cases, different formulæ should occur to determine the BH parameters, such as *ADM mass* M_{ADM} and *scalar charges* Σ^a, in terms of the geometry of the underlying (asymptotical) scalar manifold.

Finally, one may wonder about a stringy realization of the theories discussed in the present paper, and their extremal BH states. At the string tree level, the massless spectrum of $\mathcal{N}=3$ and $\mathcal{N}=5$, $d=4$ supergravity can be obtained via asymmetric orbifolds of Type II superstrings [100]–[103], or by orientifolds [104]. Furthermore, it should be remarked that in string theory the *Attractor Mechanism* is essentially a non-perturbative phenomenon, either because it fixes the dilaton, or because it involves non-perturbative string states made out of D-brane bound states [105].

It is worth pointing out once again that the present analysis only covers *non-degenerate* extremal BH attractors, determining *"large"* BH horizon geometries with *non-vanishing* classical effective BH horizon area in the field theory limit. For *degenerate* extremal BHs, having *"small"* BH horizon geometries with *vanishing* classical effective BH horizon area, a departure from the Einsteinian approximation, including higher curvature terms in the gravity sector, is *at least* required [106]. Such corrections in supersymmetric theories of gravity have been considered in [11] and [107]– [109].

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge L. Andrianopoli, M. Bianchi, A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria, F. Morales, M. Trigiante and A. Yeranyan for enlightening and fruitful discussions.

We also would like to thank Mrs. Helen Webster for careful proofreading.

A. M. would like to thank the Department of Physics, Theory Unit Group at CERN, where part of this work was done, for kind hospitality and stimulating environment.

The work of S.F. has been supported in part by the European Community Human Potential Programme under contract MRTN-CT-2004-503369 "*Constituents, Fundamental Forces and Symmetries of the Universe*" in association with LNF-INFN and in part by DOE grant DE-FG03-91ER40662, Task C.

The work of A.M. has been supported by Museo Storico della Fisica e Centro Studi e Ricerche "*Enrico Fermi*", Rome, Italy, in association with INFN-LNF.

A Appendix I
A Counterexample : $\mathcal{N}=4$ *Matter-Coupled* Supergravity

As an example of $d=4$ supergravity in which $\mathcal{I}_4$ is *not* a perfect square of an expression quadratic in all the relevant geometrical quantities (such as the *skew-eigenvalues* of the *central charge matrix* and the *matter charges*), let us consider the $\mathcal{N}=4$, $d=4$ *matter-coupled* theory [98, 99].

The real *scalar manifold* is

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}=4}=\frac{G_{\mathcal{N}=4}}{H_{\mathcal{N}=4}}=\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}\times\frac{SO(6,n)}{SO(6)\times SO(n)},\ dim_{\mathbb{R}}=6n+2. \tag{A.1}$$

The $6+n$ vector field strengths and their duals, as well as their asymptotical fluxes, sit in the *bi-fundamental* irrepr. $(\mathbf{2},(\mathbf{6}+\mathbf{n}))$ of the U-duality group $G_{\mathcal{N}=4}=SU(1,1)\times SO(6,n)$.

$Z_{AB}=Z_{[AB]}$, $A,B=1,2,3,4=\mathcal{N}$ is the *central charge matrix.* As in the *pure* supergravity treated in Sect. 7 (obtained by setting $n=0$ in Eq. (A.1)), by means of a suitable transformation of the $\mathcal{R}$-symmetry $U(1)\times SO(6)\sim U(1)\times SU(4)$, Z_{AB} can be *skew-diagonalized* by putting it in the *normal form* (see e.g. [40] and Refs. therein):

$$Z_{AB}=\begin{pmatrix}\mathcal{Z}_1\epsilon & \\ & \mathcal{Z}_2\epsilon\end{pmatrix}, \tag{A.2}$$

where $\mathcal{Z}_1,\mathcal{Z}_2\in\mathbb{R}_0^+$ are the $\mathcal{N}=4$ (moduli-dependent) *skew-eigenvalues*, which can be ordered as $\mathcal{Z}_1\geqslant\mathcal{Z}_2$ without any loss of generality (up to renamings; see *e.g.* [40]), and can be formally expressed by the very same Eqs. (6.3)-(6.5), where I_1 and I_2 are still the two (moduli-dependent) $H_{\mathcal{N}=4,pure}$(and also $H_{\mathcal{N}=4}$)-invariants.

In this case, similarly to $\mathcal{N}=3$ supergravity, also the *matter charges* Z_I ($I=1,...,n$) enter the game, $n\in\mathbb{N}$ denoting the number of matter multiplets coupled to the gravity multiplet. By a suitable rotation of $SO(n)$, the vector Z_I can be reduced in such a way that only one (strictly positive) *real* and one *complex* matter charge are non-vanishing [40]:

$$Z_I=\left(Z_1=\rho_1,Z_2=\rho_2e^{i\theta},Z_{\widehat{I}}=0\right),\quad \rho_1,\rho_2\in\mathbb{R}_0^+,\ \theta\in[0,2\pi),\ \widehat{I}=3,...,n. \tag{A.3}$$

Thus, one can introduce the (moduli-dependent, unique) $SO(n)$(and also $H_{\mathcal{N}=4}$)-invariants

$$I_3\ \equiv\ Z_I\overline{Z}^I=\rho_1^2+\rho_2^2; \tag{A.4}$$

$$I_4\ \equiv\ Re\left(Z_IZ^I\right)=\rho_1^2+\rho_2^2cos\left(2\theta\right). \tag{A.5}$$

Now, there are only three (moduli-dependent) $SO(6,n)$-invariants, reading as follows [91]:

$$\mathbb{I}_1\ \equiv\ I_1-I_3=\mathcal{Z}_1^2+\mathcal{Z}_2^2-\rho_1^2-\rho_2^2; \tag{A.6}$$

$$\mathbb{I}_2\ \equiv\ \frac{1}{4}\epsilon^{ABCD}Z_{AB}Z_{CD}-\overline{Z}_I\overline{Z}^I=2\mathcal{Z}_1\mathcal{Z}_2-\rho_1^2-\rho_2^2e^{-2i\theta}; \tag{A.7}$$

$$\mathbb{I}_3\ \equiv\ \overline{\mathbb{I}_2}=2\mathcal{Z}_1\mathcal{Z}_2-\rho_1^2-\rho_2^2e^{2i\theta}. \tag{A.8}$$

The *quartic* $G_{\mathcal{N}=4}$-invariant $\mathcal{I}_4$ of $\mathcal{N}=4$, $d=4$ supergravity is the following unique (moduli-independent) $G_{\mathcal{N}=4}$-invariant combination of $\mathbb{I}_1$, $\mathbb{I}_2$ and $\mathbb{I}_3$ [91]:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{I}_4\equiv\mathbb{I}_1^2-\mathbb{I}_2\mathbb{I}_3=\mathbb{I}_1^2-\left|\mathbb{I}_2\right|^2=\\
&=\left(\mathcal{Z}_1^2-\mathcal{Z}_2^2\right)^2+\left(Z_I\overline{Z}^I\right)^2-2\left(\mathcal{Z}_1^2+\mathcal{Z}_2^2\right)Z_I\overline{Z}^I+\\
&+2\mathcal{Z}_1\mathcal{Z}_2\left(Z_IZ^I+\overline{Z}_I\overline{Z}^I\right)-\left|Z_IZ^I\right|^2=\\
&=\left(\mathcal{Z}_1^2-\mathcal{Z}_2^2\right)^2+\left(\rho_1^2+\rho_2^2\right)^2-2\left(\mathcal{Z}_1^2+\mathcal{Z}_2^2\right)\left(\rho_1^2+\rho_2^2\right)+\\
&+4\mathcal{Z}_1\mathcal{Z}_2\left[\rho_1^2+\rho_2^2cos\left(2\theta\right)\right]-\left[\rho_1^4+\rho_1^4+2\rho_1^2\rho_2^2cos\left(2\theta\right)\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

On the other hand, in terms of the BH charges (q,p), $\mathcal{I}_4$ reads as follows (recall Eq. (7.15)):

$$\mathcal{I}_4 = 4\left[p^2 q^2 - (p\cdot q)^2\right], \tag{A.10}$$

where $p^2 \equiv p^\Lambda p^\Sigma \eta_{\Lambda\Sigma}$, $q^2 \equiv q_\Lambda q_\Sigma \eta^{\Lambda\Sigma}$, with Λ ranging $1,...,n+6$, and the scalar product $\cdot$ is defined by $\eta_{\Lambda\Sigma} = \eta^{\Lambda\Sigma}$, the Lorentzian metric with signature $(n,6)$ (see [63] and Refs. therein).

Looking at Eq. (A.9), it is easy to realize that $\mathcal{I}_4$ is a non-trivial *perfect square* of a function of degree 2 of $\mathcal{Z}_1$, $\mathcal{Z}_2$, ρ_1, ρ_2 and θ *only* in the *pure* supergravity theory (obtained by setting $n=0$), *i.e.* only in the case $\rho_1=\rho_2=0$. In such a limit, Eq. (A.9) consistently reduces to Eq. (8.1).

As an example, we can workout the case $n=1$ (which uplifts to *pure* $\mathcal{N}=4$, $d=5$ supergravity). In this case, only a (strictly positive) real *matter charge* $Z_1=\rho_1\in\mathbb{R}_0^+$ is present, and the *quartic* invariant $\mathcal{I}_4$ acquires the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_4 &= \left(\mathcal{Z}_1^2-\mathcal{Z}_2^2\right)^2 - 2\left(\mathcal{Z}_1^2+\mathcal{Z}_2^2\right)Z_1^2 + 4\mathcal{Z}_1\mathcal{Z}_2 Z_1^2 = \\
&= \left(\mathcal{Z}_1-\mathcal{Z}_2\right)^2\left[\left(\mathcal{Z}_1+\mathcal{Z}_2\right)^2 - 2Z_1^2\right] = \\
&= \left(\mathcal{Z}_1-\mathcal{Z}_2\right)^2\left(\mathcal{Z}_1+\mathcal{Z}_2+\sqrt{2}\rho_1\right)\left(\mathcal{Z}_1+\mathcal{Z}_2-\sqrt{2}\rho_1\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{A.11}$$

which is *not* a non-trivial *perfect square* of $\mathcal{Z}_1$, $\mathcal{Z}_2$ and ρ_1.

References

[1] S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh, A. Strominger: *$\mathcal{N}$= 2 extremal black holes*, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 5412 (1995).

[2] S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh: *Supersymmetry and attractors*, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 1514 (1996); S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh: *Universality of supersymmetric attractors*, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 1525 (1996).

[3] A. Strominger: *Macroscopic entropy of $\mathcal{N}$= 2 extremal black holes*, Phys. Lett. **B383**, 39 (1996).

[4] S. Ferrara, G. W. Gibbons and R. Kallosh, *Black Holes and Critical Points in Moduli Space*, Nucl. Phys. **B500**, 75 (1997), `hep-th/9702103`.

[5] For reviews on black holes in superstring theory see *e.g.*: J. M. Maldacena: *Black-Holes in String Theory*, `hep-th/9607235`; A. W. Peet: *TASI lectures on black holes in string theory*, `arXiv:hep-th/0008241`; B. Pioline: *Lectures on black holes, topological strings and quantum attractors*, Class. Quant. Grav. **23**, S981 (2006); A. Dabholkar: *Black hole entropy and attractors*, Class. Quant. Grav. **23**, S957 (2006).

[6] For recent reviews see: J. H. Schwarz: *Lectures on superstring and M-theory dualities*, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **B55**, 1 (1997); M. J. Duff: *M-theory (the theory formerly known as strings)*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A11**, 5623 (1996); A. Sen: *Unification of string dualities*, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **58**, 5 (1997).

[7] J. H. Schwarz, A. Sen: *Duality symmetries of 4D heterotic strings*, Phys. Lett. **B312**, 105 (1993); J. H. Schwarz, A. Sen: *Duality Symmetrical Actions*, Nucl. Phys. **B411**, 35 (1994).

[8] M. Gasperini, J. Maharana, G. Veneziano: *From trivial to non-trivial conformal string backgrounds via $O(d,d)$ transformations*, Phys. Lett. **B272**, 277 (1991); J. Maharana, J. H. Schwarz: *Noncompact Symmetries in String Theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B390**, 3 (1993).

[9] E. Witten: *String Theory Dynamics in Various Dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B443**, 85 (1995).

[10] J. H. Schwarz: *M-theory extensions of T duality*, `arXiv:hep-th/9601077`; C. Vafa: *Evidence for F-theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B469**, 403 (1996).

[11] A. Sen, *Black Hole Entropy Function and the Attractor Mechanism in Higher Derivative Gravity*, JHEP **09**, 038 (2005), `hep-th/0506177`.

[12] K. Goldstein, N. Iizuka, R. P. Jena and S. P. Trivedi, *Non-Supersymmetric Attractors*, Phys. Rev. **D72**, 124021 (2005), `hep-th/0507096`.

[13] A. Sen, *Entropy Function for Heterotic Black Holes*, JHEP **03**, 008 (2006), `hep-th/0508042`.

[14] R. Kallosh, *New Attractors*, JHEP **0512**, 022 (2005), `hep-th/0510024`.

[15] P. K. Tripathy and S. P. Trivedi, *Non-Supersymmetric Attractors in String Theory,* JHEP **0603**, 022 (2006), `hep-th/0511117`.

[16] A. Giryavets, *New Attractors and Area Codes*, JHEP **0603**, 020 (2006), `hep-th/0511215`.

[17] K. Goldstein, R. P. Jena, G. Mandal and S. P. Trivedi, *A C-Function for Non-Supersymmetric Attractors,* JHEP **0602**, 053 (2006), `hep-th/0512138`.

[18] M. Alishahiha and H. Ebrahim, *Non-supersymmetric attractors and entropy function*, JHEP **0603**, 003 (2006), `hep-th/0601016`.

[19] R. Kallosh, N. Sivanandam and M. Soroush, *The Non-BPS Black Hole Attractor Equation*, JHEP **0603**, 060 (2006), `hep-th/0602005`.

[20] B. Chandrasekhar, S. Parvizi, A. Tavanfar and H. Yavartanoo, *Non-supersymmetric attractors in $\mathcal{R}^2$ gravities*, JHEP **0608**, 004 (2006), `hep-th/0602022`.

[21] J. P. Hsu, A. Maloney and A. Tomasiello, *Black Hole Attractors and Pure Spinors*, JHEP **0609**, 048 (2006), `hep-th/0602142`.

[22] S. Bellucci, S. Ferrara and A. Marrani, *On some properties of the Attractor Equations*, Phys. Lett. **B635**, 172 (2006), `hep-th/0602161`.

[23] S. Ferrara and R. Kallosh, *On $\mathcal{N}=8$ attractors*, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 125005 (2006), `hep-th/0603247`.

[24] M. Alishahiha and H. Ebrahim, *New attractor, Entropy Function and Black Hole Partition Function*, JHEP **0611**, 017 (2006), `hep-th/0605279`.

[25] S. Bellucci, S. Ferrara, M. Günaydin and A. Marrani, *Charge Orbits of Symmetric Special Geometries and Attractors*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A21**, 5043 (2006), `hep-th/0606209`.

[26] D. Astefanesei, K. Goldstein, R. P. Jena, A. Sen and S. P. Trivedi, *Rotating Attractors*, JHEP **0610**, 058 (2006), `hep-th/0606244`.

[27] R. Kallosh, N. Sivanandam and M. Soroush, *Exact Attractive non-BPS STU Black Holes*, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 065008 (2006), `hep-th/0606263`.

[28] P. Kaura and A. Misra, *On the Existence of Non-Supersymmetric Black Hole Attractors for Two-Parameter Calabi-Yau's and Attractor Equations*, Fortsch. Phys. **54**, 1109 (2006), `hep-th/0607132`.

[29] G. L. Cardoso, V. Grass, D. Lüst and J. Perz, *Extremal non-BPS Black Holes and Entropy Extremization*, JHEP **0609**, 078 (2006), `hep-th/0607202`.

[30] J. F. Morales and H. Samtleben, *Entropy function and attractors for AdS black holes*, JHEP **0610**, 074 (2006), `hep-th/0608044`.

[31] D. Astefanesei, K. Goldstein and S. Mahapatra, *Moduli and (un)attractor black hole thermodynamics*, `hep-th/0611140`.

[32] G.L. Cardoso, B. de Wit and S. Mahapatra, *Black hole entropy functions and attractor equations*, JHEP **0703**, 085 (2007) `hep-th/0612225`.

[33] R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara and M. Trigiante, C*ritical points of the Black-Hole potential for homogeneous special geometries*, JHEP **0703**, 097 (2007), `hep-th/0701090`.

[34] S. Bellucci, S. Ferrara and A. Marrani, *Attractor Horizon Geometries of Extremal Black Holes*, contribution to the Proceedings of the XVII SIGRAV Conference,4–7 September 2006, Turin, Italy, `hep-th/0702019`.

[35] A. Ceresole and G. Dall'Agata, *Flow Equations for Non-BPS Extremal Black Holes*, JHEP **0703**, 110 (2007), `hep-th/0702088`.

[36] L. Andrianopoli, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara and M. Trigiante, *Black Hole Attractors in $\mathcal{N}=1$ Supergravity*, JHEP **0707**, 019 (2007), `hep-th/0703178`.

[37] K. Saraikin and C. Vafa, *Non-supersymmetric Black Holes and Topological Strings*, Class. Quant. Grav. **25**, 095007 (2008), `hep-th/0703214`.

[38] S. Ferrara and A. Marrani, *$\mathcal{N}=8$ non-BPS Attractors, Fixed Scalars and Magic Supergravities*, Nucl. Phys. **B788**, 63 (2008), `arXiV:0705.3866`.

[39] S. Nampuri, P. K. Tripathy and S. P. Trivedi, *On The Stability of Non-Supersymmetric Attractors in String Theory*, JHEP **0708**, 054 (2007), `arXiV:0705.4554`.

[40] L. Andrianopoli, R. D'Auria, E. Orazi, M. Trigiante, *First Order Description of Black Holes in Moduli Space*, JHEP **0711**, 032 (2007), `arXiV:0706.0712`.

[41] S. Ferrara and A. Marrani, *On the Moduli Space of non-BPS Attractors for $\mathcal{N}=2$ Symmetric Manifolds*, Phys. Lett. **B652**, 111 (2007) , `arXiV:0706.1667`.

[42] D.Astefanesei and H. Yavartanoo, *Stationary black holes and attractor mechanism*, Nucl. Phys. **B794**, 13 (2008), `arXiv:0706.1847`.

[43] G. L. Cardoso, A. Ceresole, G. Dall'Agata, J. M. Oberreuter, J. Perz, *First-order flow equations for extremal black holes in very special geometry*, JHEP **0710**, 063 (2007), `arXiV:0706.3373`.

[44] A. Misra and P. Shukla, *'Area codes', large volume (non-)perturbative alpha-prime and instanton: Corrected non-supersymmetric (A)dS minimum, the 'inverse problem' and 'fake superpotentials' for multiple-singular-loci-two-parameter Calabi-Yau's*, `arXiV:0707.0105`.

[45] A. Ceresole, S. Ferrara and A. Marrani, *4d/5d Correspondence for the Black Hole Potential and its Critical Points*, Class. Quant. Grav. **24**, 5651 (2007), `arXiV:0707.0964`.

[46] M. M. Anber and D. Kastor, *The Attractor mechanism in Gauss-Bonnet gravity*, JHEP **0710**, 084 (2007), `arXiv:0707.1464`.

[47] Y. S. Myung, Y.-W. Kim and Y.-J. Park, *New attractor mechanism for spherically symmetric extremal black holes*, Phys. Rev. **D76**, 104045 (2007), `arXiv:0707.1933`.

[48] S. Bellucci, A. Marrani, E. Orazi and A. Shcherbakov, *Attractors with Vanishing Central Charge*, Phys. Lett. **B655**, 185 (2007), `arXiV:0707.2730`.

[49] K. Hotta and T. Kubota, *Exact Solutions and the Attractor Mechanism in Non-BPS Black Holes*, Prog. Theor. Phys. **118N5**, 969 (2007), `arXiv:0707.4554`.

[50] X. Gao, *Non-supersymmetric Attractors in Born-Infeld Black Holes with a Cosmological Constant*, JHEP **0711**, 006 (2007), `arXiv:0708.1226`.

[51] A. Sen, *Black Hole Entropy Function, Attractors and Precision Counting of Microstates*, `arXiv:0708.1270`.

[52] A. Belhaj, L.B. Drissi, E.H. Saidi and A. Segui, *$\mathcal{N}$= 2 Supersymmetric Black Attractors in Six and Seven Dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B796**, 521 (2008), `arXiv:0709.0398`.

[53] D. Gaiotto, W. Li and M. Padi, *Non-Supersymmetric Attractor Flow in Symmetric Spaces*, JHEP **0712**, 093 (2007), `arXiv:0710.1638`.

[54] E. G. Gimon, F. Larsen and J. Simon, *Black Holes in Supergravity: the non-BPS Branch*, JHEP **0801**, 040 (2008), `arXiv:0710.4967`.

[55] D. Astefanesei, H. Nastase, H. Yavartanoo and S. Yun, *Moduli flow and non-supersymmetric AdS attractors*, JHEP **0804**, 074 (2008), `arXiv:0711.0036`.

[56] S. Bellucci, S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh and A. Marrani, *Extremal Black Hole and Flux Vacua Attractors*, contribution to the Proceedings of the Winter School on Attractor Mechanism 2006 (SAM2006), 20-24 March 2006, INFN-LNF, Frascati, Italy, `arXiv:0711.4547`.

[57] R.-G. Cai and D.-W. Pang, *A Note on exact solutions and attractor mechanism for non-BPS black holes*, JHEP **0801**, 046 (2008), `arXiv:0712.0217`.

[58] M. Huebscher, P. Meessen, T. Ortín and S. Vaulà, *Supersymmetric $\mathcal{N}$= 2 Einstein-Yang-Mills monopoles and covariant attractors*, `arXiv:0712.1530`.

[59] W. Li: *Non-Supersymmetric Attractors in Symmetric Coset Spaces*, contribution to the Proceedings of 3rd School on Attractor Mechanism (SAM 2007), Frascati, Italy, 18-22 Jun 2007, `arXiv:0801.2536`.

[60] E. H. Saidi, *BPS and non BPS 7D Black Attractors in M-Theory on K3*, `arXiv:0802.0583`.

[61] E. H. Saidi, *On Black Hole Effective Potential in 6D/7D $\mathcal{N}$= 2 Supergravity*, `arXiv:0803.0827`.

[62] E. H. Saidi and A. Segui, *Entropy of Pairs of Dual Attractors in six and seven Dimensions*, `arXiv:0803.2945`.

[63] S. Ferrara, K. Hayakawa and A. Marrani, *Erice Lectures on Black Holes and Attractors*, contribution to the Proceedings of the International School of Subnuclear Physics, 45th course *"Search for the "Totally Unexpected" in the LHC Era"*, 29 August–7 September 2007, Erice, Italy, `arXiv:0805.2498`.

[64] D. Astefanesei, N. Banerjee and S. Dutta, *(Un)attractor black holes in higher derivative AdS gravity*, `arXiv:0806.1334`.

[65] M. Huebscher, P. Meessen, T. Ortín and S. Vaulà, *$\mathcal{N}$= 2 Einstein-Yang-Mills's BPS solutions*, `arXiv:0806.1477`.

[66] E. Bergshoeff, W. Chemissany, A. Ploegh, M. Trigiante and T. Van Riet, *Generating Geodesic Flows and Supergravity Solutions*, `arXiv:0806.2310`.

[67] H. Ooguri, A. Strominger and C. Vafa: *Black Hole Attractors and the Topological String*, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 106007 (2004), `hep-th/0405146`.

[68] H. Ooguri, C. Vafa and E. Verlinde: *Hartle-Hawking wave-function for flux compactifications: the Entropic Principle*, Lett. Math. Phys. **74**, 311 (2005), `hep-th/0502211`.

[69] M. Aganagic, A. Neitzke and C. Vafa: *BPS microstates and the open topological string wave function*, `hep-th/0504054`.

[70] S. Gukov, K. Saraikin and C. Vafa: *The Entropic Principle and Asymptotic Freedom*, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 066010 (2006), `hep-th/0509109`.

[71] L. Andrianopoli, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara and M. Trigiante: *Extremal Black Holes in Supergravity*, in : *"String Theory and Fundamental Interactions"*,M. Gasperini and J. Maharana eds. (LNP, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg, 2007), `hep-th/0611345`.

[72] S. W. Hawking: *Gravitational Radiation from Colliding Black Holes*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **26**, 1344 (1971); J. D. Bekenstein: *Black Holes and Entropy*, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 2333 (1973).

[73] E. Cremmer, J. Scherk and S. Ferrara, *$SU(4)$ Invariant Supergravity Theory*, Phys. Lett. **B74**, 61 (1978).

[74] B. de Wit and H. Nicolai, *Extended Supergravity with Local $SO(5)$ Invariance*, Nucl. Phys. **B188**, 98 (1981).

[75] J. F. Luciani: *Coupling of $O(2)$ Supergravity with Several Vector Multiplets*, Nucl. Phys. **B132**, 325 (1978).

[76] L. Castellani, A. Ceresole, S. Ferrara, R. D'Auria, P. Fré and E. Maina, *The Complete $\mathcal{N}$= 3 Matter Coupled Supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B268**, 317 (1986).

[77] R. Kallosh, A. D. Linde, T. Ortín, A. W. Peet, A. Van Proeyen: *Supersymmetry as a cosmic censor*, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 5278 (1992), `hep-th/9205027`; R. Kallosh, T. Ortín, A. W. Peet: *Entropy and action of dilaton black holes*, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 5400 (1993), `hep-th/9211015`; R. Kallosh, A. W. Peet: *Dilaton black holes near the horizon*, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 5223 (1992), `hep-th/9209116`.

[78] D. Garfinkle, G. T. Horowitz and A. Strominger: *Charged black holes in string theory*, Phys. Rev. **D43**, 3140 (1991) [Erratum-ibid. **D45**, 3888 (1992)].

[79] D.Z. Freedman, C. Nunez, M. Schnabl and K. Skenderis, *Fake supergravity and domain wall stability*, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 104027 (2004), `hep-th/0312055`; A. Celi, A. Ceresole, G. Dall'Agata, A. Van Proeyen and M. Zagermann, *On the fakeness of fake supergravity*, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 045009 (2005), `hep-th/0410126`; M. Zagermann, *$\mathcal{N}$= 4 fake supergravity*, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 125007 (2005), `hep-th/0412081`; K. Skenderis and P. K. Townsend, *Hidden supersymmetry of domain walls and cosmologies*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 191301 (2006), `hep-th/0602260`; D. Bazeia, C.B. Gomes, L. Losano and R. Menezes, *First-order formalism and dark energy*, Phys. Lett. **B633**, 415 (2006), `astro-ph/0512197`; K. Skenderis and P. K. Townsend, *Pseudo-Supersymmetry and the Domain-Wall/Cosmology Correspondence*, J. Phys. **A40**, 6733 (2007), `hep-th/0610253`.

[80] G. W. Gibbons and C. M. Hull, *A Bogomol'ny Bound for General Relativity and Solitons in $N = 2$ Supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B109**, 190 (1982).

[81] M. Günaydin, G. Sierra and P. K. Townsend, *The Geometry of $\mathcal{N}= 2$ Maxwell-Einstein Supergravity and Jordan Algebras*, Nucl. Phys. **B242**, 244 (1984).

[82] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C. W. Misner: *Canonical Variables for General Relativity*, Phys. Rev. **117**, 1595 (1960).

[83] J. Rahmfeld, *Extremal black holes as bound states*, Phys. Lett. **B372**, 198 (1996), `hep-th/9512089`; M. J. Duff and J. Rahmfeld, *Bound states of black holes and other p-branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B481**, 332 (1996), `hep-th/9605085`; F. Denef, *Supergravity flows and D-brane stability*, JHEP **0008**, 050 (2000), `hep-th/0005049`; D. Gaiotto, A. Simons, A. Strominger and X. Yin, *D0-branes in black hole attractors*, `hep-th/0412179`; A. Ritz, M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, M. B. Voloshin, *Marginal stability and the metamorphosis of BPS states*, Phys. Rev. **D63**, 065018 (2001), `hep-th/0006028`; P. S. Aspinwall, A. Maloney, A. Simons, *Black hole entropy, marginal stability and mirror symmetry*, JHEP **0707**, 034 (2007), `hep-th/0610033`; A. Sen, *Walls of Marginal Stability and Dyon Spectrum in $\mathcal{N}= 4$ Supersymmetric String Theories*, JHEP **0705**, 039 (2007), `hep-th/0702141`; F. Denef, D. Gaiotto, A. Strominger, D. Van den Bleeken and X. Yin, *Black Hole Deconstruction*, `hep-th/0703252`; A. Sen, *$\mathcal{N}= 8$ Dyon Partition Function and Walls of Marginal Stability*, `arXiv:0803.1014`.

[84] A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria and S. Ferrara: *The Symplectic Structure of $\mathcal{N}= 2$ Supergravity and Its Central Extension*, Talk given at ICTP Trieste Conference on Physical and Mathematical Implications of Mirror Symmetry in String Theory, Trieste, Italy, 5-9 June 1995, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **46** (1996), `hep-th/9509160`.

[85] S. Bellucci, S. Ferrara, A. Marrani and A. Yeranyan, *The STU Unveiled*, to appear.

[86] S. Helgason, *Differential Geometry, Lie Groups and Symmetric Spaces* (Academic Press, New York, 1978).

[87] R. Gilmore, *Lie Groups, Lie Algebras, and Some of Their Applications* (Dover Publications, 2006).

[88] M. K. Gaillard and B. Zumino, *Duality Rotations for Interacting Fields*, Nucl. Phys. **B193**, 221 (1981).

[89] L. Andrianopoli, R. D'Auria and S. Ferrara, *Central extension of extended supergravities in diverse dimensions*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A12**, 3759 (1997), `hep-th/9608015`.

[90] L. Andrianopoli, R. D'Auria and S. Ferrara, *U duality and central charges in various dimensions revisited*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A13**, 431 (1998), `hep-th/9612105`.

[91] L. Andrianopoli, R. D'Auria and S. Ferrara, *U invariants, black hole entropy and fixed scalars*, Phys. Lett. **B403**, 12 (1997), `hep-th/9703156`.

[92] S. Ferrara, J. Scherk and B. Zumino, *Algebraic Properties of Extended Supergravity Theories*, Nucl. Phys. **B121**, 393 (1977).

[93] R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara and M. A. Lledó, *On central charges and Hamiltonians for 0-brane dynamics*, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 084007 (1999), `hep-th/9903089`.

[94] R. D'Auria and S. Ferrara, *On fermion masses, gradient flows and potential in supersymmetric theories*, JHEP **0105**, 034 (2001), `hep-th/0103153`.

[95] B. de Wit, *Properties Of $SO(8)$ Extended Supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B158**, 189 (1979).

[96] R. Slansky, *Group Theory for Unified Model Building*, Phys. Rep. **79**, 1 (1981).

[97] M. Cvetic nd D. Youm, *Dyonic BPS saturated black holes of heterotic string on a six torus*, Phys. Rev. **D53**, 584 (1996), `hep-th/9507090`; M. J. Duff, J. T. Liu and J. Rahmfeld, *Four-dimensional string-string-string triality*, Nucl. Phys. **B459**, 125 (1996), `hep-th/9508094`; M. Cvetic and A. A. Tseytlin, *Solitonic strings and BPS saturated dyonic black holes*, Phys. Rev. **D53**, 5619 (1996); Erratum-ibid. **D55**, 3907 (1997), `hep-th/9512031`.

[98] E. Bergshoeff, I. G. Koh and E. Sezgin, *Coupling of Yang-Mills to $\mathcal{N}= 4$, $D = 4$ Supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B155**, 71 (1985).

[99] M. de Roo and P. Wagemans, *Gauge Matter Coupling In $\mathcal{N}= 4$ Supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B262**, 644 (1985).

[100] S. Ferrara and C. Kounnas, *Extended Supersymmetry In Four-Dimensional Type II Strings*, Nucl. Phys. **B328**, 406 (1989).

[101] S. Ferrara and P. Fré, *Type II Superstrings On Twisted Group Manifolds And Their Heterotic Counterparts*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A5**, 989 (1990).

[102] A. Dabholkar and J. A. Harvey, *String Islands*, JHEP **9902**, 006 (1999), `hep-th/9809122`.

[103] C. Kounnas and A. Kumar, *BPS states in $\mathcal{N}= 3$ Superstrings*, Nucl. Phys. **B511**, 216 (1998), `hep-th/9709061`.

[104] A. R. Frey and J. Polchinski, *$\mathcal{N}= 3$ Warped Compactifications*, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 126009 (2002), `hep-th/0201029`.

[105] M. Bianchi, *Bound-states of D-branes in L-R asymmetric superstring vacua*, `arXiv:0805.3276`.

[106] R. M. Wald, *Black hole entropy in the Noether charge*, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 3427 (1993), `gr-qc/9307038`; T. Jacobson, G. Kang and R. C. Myers, *On Black Hole Entropy*, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 6587 (1994), `gr-qc/9312023`; V. Iyer and R. M. Wald, *Some properties of Noether charge and a proposal for dynamical black hole entropy*, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 846 (1994), `gr-qc/9403028`; T. Jacobson, G. Kang and R. C. Myers, *Black hole entropy in higher curvature gravity*, `gr-qc/9502009`.

[107] J. M. Maldacena, A. Strominger and E. Witten, *Black Hole Entropy in M Theory*, JHEP **9712**, 002 (1997), `hep-th/9711053`.

[108] G. Lopes Cardoso, B. de Wit and T. Mohaupt, *Corrections to Macroscopic Supersymmetric Black Hole Entropy*, Phys. Lett. **B451**, 309 (1999), `hep-th/9812082`.

[109] P. Kraus and F. Larsen, *Microscopic Black Hole Entropy in Theories with Higher Derivatives*, JHEP **0509**, 034 (2005), `hep-th/0506176`.